

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXVII *November 1939*

NUMBER 2

ALLEGED IMITATIONS OF PETRARCH IN THE *FILOSTRATO*

GORDON R. SILBER

TWO passages in Boccaccio's *Filostrato* have been regarded as imitations of undated sonnets of Petrarch by scholars who have assumed that Boccaccio was acquainted with some of Petrarch's lyric poems by 1338, the year in which the *Filostrato* was probably written.¹ Savj-Lopez held that *Filostrato*, iii, 83-85 is Petrarchan in inspiration,² and this opinion was accepted by President Wilkins, who declared that *Filostrato*, v, 54-55 also is derived from a sonnet by Petrarch.³ A third passage, *Filostrato*, v, 62, was said to be Petrarchan by Savj-Lopez, but Volpi showed that this and the three following *ottave* are a close paraphrase of the canzone *La dolce vista e 'l bel guardo soave* by Cino da Pistoia and that the resemblances between Boccaccio and Petrarch result from the fact that Petrarch also drew upon that canzone.⁴

Inasmuch as there is no clear evidence of a knowledge of Petrarch's

¹ H. Hauvette, *Boccace* (Paris, 1914), p. 88.

² "Il *Filostrato* di G. Boccaccio," *Romania*, XXVII (1898), 465.

³ E. H. Wilkins, "Notes on Petrarch," *MLN*, XXXII (1917), 196-98.

⁴ G. Volpi, "Una Canzone di Cino da Pistoia nel *Filostrato*," *Bullettino storico Pistoiese*, I (1899), 116-18. Volpi's correction of Savj-Lopez's error shows strikingly how easily one may go astray in applying the term "Petrarchan" or in attempting to assert definitely that a given passage in Trecento poetry is imitated from a given author or a specific source. The methodological difficulties which attend the proof of such assertions are excellently shown also in Professor D. R. Stuart's article, "Petrarch's indebtedness to the *Libellus* of Catullus," *Transactions and proceedings of the American Philological Association*, XLVIII (1917), 3-26. These considerations may serve to justify the detail with which the present study is presented.

poetry on the part of Boccaccio as early as 1338, or, indeed, for some years thereafter,⁵ a detailed examination of the two allegedly imitated passages in the *Filostrato* has been undertaken in order to determine whether these can actually be regarded as proof that Boccaccio was acquainted with poems from the *Canzoniere* at that date. The conclusions reached may not only add to our knowledge of Boccaccio's sources for the *Filostrato* and of the chronology of his relations with Petrarch, but also contribute to what we know concerning the circulation of Petrarch's poems during his earlier years and the extent of his early fame among his contemporaries, subjects which appear not to have been fully studied.

I

In the "Hymn to love" which Troilo sang after his love for Criseida had been rewarded (*Filostrato*, iii, 74-89), the following stanzas occur:

*E benedico il tempo, l'anno e 'l mese,
Il giorno, l'ora e 'l punto che costei
Onesta, bella, leggiadra e cortese,
Primieramente apparve agli occhi miei;
Benedico figliuolo che m'accese
Del suo valor per la virtù di lei,
E che m'ha fatto a lei servo verace,
Negli occhi suoi ponendo la mia pace.*

*E benedico i ferventi sospiri
Ch'io ho per lei cacciati già del petto,
E benedico i pianti e li martiri
Che fatti m'ha avere amor perfetto,
E benedico i focosi disiri
Tratti del suo più bel che altro aspetto,
Perciocché prezzo di sì alta cosa
Istati sono, e tanto graziosa.*

*Ma sopra tutti benedico Iddio
Che tanto cara donna diede al mondo,
E che tanto di lume ancor nel mio
Discerner pose in questo basso fondo,
Che 'n lei innanzi ogni altro il gran disio*

⁵ External evidence for the date of the beginning of Boccaccio's acquaintance with Petrarch's Italian poems is reviewed in my forthcoming study, *The influence of Dante and Petrarch on certain of Boccaccio's lyrics*.

Io accendessi, e fossine giocondo.
 A che grazie giammai non si porieno
 Render per uom, quai render si dovrieno [*Fil.*, iii, 83-85].⁶

In this passage Boccaccio has obviously adopted a theme frequently met in medieval and Renaissance love poetry, the invocation of a series of blessings or curses, the most famous example of which is Petrarch's sonnet *Benedetto sia 'l giorno, e 'l mese, e l'anno* (*Canzoniere* LXI). Boccaccio's stanzas have been regarded as an imitation of this sonnet by Savj-Lopez and by Wilkins in the articles cited above and also by Lommatzsch,⁷ while Schuchardt,⁸ Hauvette,⁹ and Vitaletti¹⁰ have taken the opposite view, holding that Boccaccio was drawing on general poetic tradition rather than on a specific source in Petrarch or elsewhere. Although it would seem that any positive statement on the subject would require supporting evidence, the scholars quoted, with one exception, have offered no evidence for their views but have based them seemingly on subjective grounds;¹¹ the exception is Wilkins, who, after conceding that "the initial repetition of *benedetto* or an equivalent word or phrase is . . . a popular device," indicates the grounds for his opinion in the general statement that "the correspond-

⁶ The *Filostrato* is cited from *Il Filostrato e il Ninfale fiesolano*, a cura di V. Pernicone (Bari, 1937), and Petrarch from *Le Rime sparse e i Trionfi*, a cura di E. Chiòrboli (Bari, 1930).

⁷ E. Lommatzsch, "Benedetto sia 'l giorno e 'l mese e l'anno....," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XLIII (1923), 681.

⁸ H. Schuchardt, *Ritornell und Tersine* (Halle, 1874), p. 121.

⁹ H. Hauvette, *Boccace*, p. 89, n.1, bases his opinion on the arguments that the theme is traditional (cf. n. 14 below), and that Boccaccio probably did not know Petrarch's lyrics at the time of the composition of the *Filostrato*.

¹⁰ G. Vitaletti, "Benedizioni e maledizioni in amore," *Archivum Romanicum*, III (1919), 212. Both Vitaletti and Lommatzsch note the occurrence of the theme also in another sonnet by Petrarch (which is undated):

"I benedico il loco e 'l tempo e l'ora
 Che s'alto miraron gli occhi mei" [*Canz.*, XIII, 5-6].

¹¹ Those who have asserted that Boccaccio imitated Petrarch seem to have assumed that this was the case because they considered Petrarch the greater poet and were thus predisposed to regard parallels as evidence of his influence on a lesser contemporary; for example, Lommatzsch writes: "Wohl aber darf man mit Sicherheit annehmen, dass die Erinnerung an das noch junge Sonett Petrarca's den jugendlichen Giovanni Boccaccio leitete. . . ." Schuchardt and Vitaletti, on the other hand, since they are seeking to establish that the *benedetto-maledetto* theme came ultimately from popular poetry, assume, without attempting a demonstration, that the passages in Petrarch and Boccaccio were both derived from this source and hence independent of each other; Vitaletti's statement exemplifies this procedure: "A me non sembra che si possa parlare di plagio nè sia affatto arrischiato l'asserire che entrambi i poeti, ciascuno per proprio conto, immettevano nei loro versi, nobilitandolo, un tenue filo che a loro giungeva dal patrimonio popolare."

ences in detail between the passages in Petrarch and Boccaccio are so close as to show that one passage must have been derived from the other." Granted that there are close correspondences in detail, a careful study of the two passages may lead to another conclusion.

The text of Petrarch's sonnet follows:

*Benedetto sia 'l giorno, e 'l mese, e l'anno,
E la stagione, e 'l tempo, e l'ora, e 'l punto,
E 'l bel paese, e 'l loco ov'io fui giunto
Da' duo begli occhi, che legato m'hanno;
E benedetto il primo dolce affanno
Ch'i' ebbi ad esser con Amor congiunto,
E l'arco, e le saette ond'i' fui punto,
E le piaghe che 'n fin al cor mi vanno.
Benedette le voci tante ch'io
Chiamando il nome de mia donna ho sparte,
E i sospiri, e le lagrime, e 'l desio;
E benedette sian tutte le carte
Ov'io fama l'acquisto, e 'l pensier mio,
Ch'è sol di lei, s'è ch'altra non v'ha parte [Canz., LXI].*

The points which both texts have in common beyond dispute have been italicized above: the invocation of blessings on the day, month, year, time, hour, and moment of the speaker's first sight of his lady-love, and on certain of his love symptoms: sighs, tears, and desires. In connection with love symptoms we note also two more general parallels between the passages: (1) *i pianti e li martiri Che fatti m'ha avere amor perfetto* in Boccaccio and *le piaghe che 'n fin al cor mi vanno* in Petrarch, and (2) references to the conventional Cupid, directly in Boccaccio as *figliuolo che m'accese Del suo valor* and indirectly in Petrarch's allusion to *l'arco, e le saette ond'i' fui punto*. There is, finally, the very general parallel between the two references to the power of the lady's eyes: Boccaccio's verse *Negli occhi suoi ponendo la mia pace* and Petrarch's *duo begli occhi, che legato m'hanno*.

On the other hand, there are important points of difference between the two. In the *Filostrato* and not in Petrarch are the following points: (1) laudatory description of the lady (iii, 83, 3; iii, 84, 6-8), a theme entirely absent from Petrarch; (2) the theme of love slavery (iii, 83, 7); (3) the invocation of blessings on God, not only because he created the lady but because he gave the poet discernment to fall in love with her,

the point to which Boccaccio devotes the last of the three stanzas. In Petrarch and not in the *Filostrato* are the following: (1) the invocation of blessings on the place where the poet first beheld his lady (vs. 3); (2) the invocation of blessings on his own words, his poems in his lady's honor, and his thought, which is concentrated on her (vss. 9-14), details quite typical of Petrarch's self-consciousness.¹²

The points which are identical and the general parallels listed above would be convincing evidence of a relationship between the two passages if other examples of *benedetto* and *maledetto* passages (which we may regard as variants of a single motive) were not to be found in the works of the predecessors of Boccaccio and Petrarch. It is obvious, however, from the number of examples in Provençal and Italian poets noted by Lommatzsch and Vitaletti in the studies cited above and by commentators on Petrarch, that we are here dealing with a formula that had become firmly established before Boccaccio and Petrarch used it, and it is therefore necessary to study their treatments of it in relation to such other examples as can be dated with certainty before 1338. When we take these other examples into consideration it becomes clear that the points in which Petrarch's sonnet and *Filostrato*, iii, 83-85 are identical are points which are found also in earlier poets; thus, the invocation of blessings or curses on the day and time at which the poet has fallen in love is common,¹³ enumerations such as mark the

¹² A minor point of difference is the inclusion by Petrarch of *la stagione* in the opening enumeration. This is not in the *Filostrato*, but it does appear in a similar enumeration in the *Ninfale fiesolano* of 1344 or 1345 (Pernicone ed., 274, 1-4):

"Benedetto sia l'anno e 'l mese e 'l giorno,
E l'ora e 'l tempo, ed ancor la stagione,
Che fu creato questo viso adorno,
E l'altre membra, con tanta ragione!"

These verses are cited by Lommatzsch and Vitaletti in their studies, and also by K. Witte, *Das Dekameron von Giovanni di Boccaccio* (3d ed.; Leipzig, 1859), I, lix. Their similarity to Petrarch's sonnet led Witte to comment that "nothwendig der eine von diesen zwei Freunden den andern abgeschrieben haben muss;—doch wohl Boccaccio den Dichter von Vaucluse."

¹³ Cf. Peire Vidal (Anglade text as corrected by A. Kolsen, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXXXIV [1916], 425, n. 1):

"Ben ala.l temps e.l jorn e l'an e.l mes
Que.l dous cors gais, plazentiers, gen noiritz,
Per los melhors deziratz e grazitz,
De lei qu'es tan complida de totz bes
Me sap ferir al cor d'un dous esgar
Don ja no.m volh departir ne sebrar";

Dante (*Vita nuova*, xxiv, 2): "pareami che [Amore] lietamente mi dicesse nel cor mio:

first two verses of the above passages are common,¹⁴ and other poets before Boccaccio and Petrarch had invoked blessings on the sufferings which love caused them.¹⁵ The specific symptoms, sighs, tears, and desires, and all the general parallels listed above, are without exception commonplace among the themes and vocabulary of the poetry of Boccaccio's and Petrarch's immediate predecessors and contemporaries. We may conclude, therefore, that the two passages have in common no details which are not found in earlier *benedetto-maledetto* passages on the one hand or in the conventional material of the *dolce stil nuovo* on the other. Consequently we must envisage the possibility

'Pensa di benedicere lo di che io ti presi, però che tu lo del fare'; Cino (G. Zaccagnini, *Le Rime di Cino da Pistoia* [Genève, 1925], p. 90):

"I' maladico il di ch' i' vidi imprima
La luce de' vostr' occhi traditori
E 'l punto che veniste in su la cima
Del core a trarne l'anima di fori";

Cecco Angiollieri (A. F. Massera, *Sonetti burleschi e realistici dei primi due secoli* [Bari, 1920], I, 65):

"Maladetto e distrutto sia da Dio
Lo primo punto, ch'io innamorai
Di quella....";

Pieraccio Tedaldi (*Sonetti burleschi e realistici*, II, 39):

"El maladetto di, che io pensai
E poi ch' i' consenti' di rammogliarmi....";

Ugo da Massa di Siena (MS Palatino 418, ed. A. Bartoli and T. Casini, *Propugnatore*, N.S., I [1888], pt. I, p. 423):

"Eo maladico l'ora k'en promero
Amal...."

¹⁴ Cf. the citation from Peire Vidal in the preceding note, and Cecco Angiollieri (*Sonetti burleschi e realistici*, I, 91):

"Maladetta sie l'or' e 'l punt' e 'l giorno
E la semana e 'l mese e tutto l'anno....";

Mare amoroso, vss. 161-63 (in B. Latini, *I libri naturali del "Tesoro"*, commentati e illustrati da G. Battelli [Firenze, 1917], p. 209):

"Guardando l'anno, il mese e la semana,
E 'l giorno, e l'ora, il punto e lo quadrante
Del più gentil pianeta...."

Hauvette (*Boccace*, p. 89, n. 1) makes the plausible suggestion that such enumerations derive ultimately from the following passage in the Vulgate: *Et soluti sunt quatuor Angeli, qui parati erant in horam et diem, et mensem et annum . . .* (Apoc. 9:15).

¹⁵ Cf. Perdigon (H. J. Chaytor, *Les chansons de Perdigon* [Paris, 1926], p. 4):

"Ben aio.l mal e.l afan e.l consir
Qu'leu al sufert lonjamen per amor";

Rugierone di Palermo (A. D'Ancona e D. Comparetti, *Le antiche rime volgari secondo la lezione del codice Vaticano 3793* [Bologna, 1875], I, 148):

"Ben agia lo martore
Ch'lo per lei lungiamente agio durato."

that the two passages are independent in origin, and we are not justified in saying that the similarities listed constitute proof that Boccaccio imitated Petrarch, although, on the other hand, we are not justified in saying that the fact that very similar material occurs in earlier poetry constitutes proof that Boccaccio did not imitate Petrarch.

One of the points of difference between the passages provides, however, an *argumentum ex silentio* which would tend to support the view that Boccaccio did not imitate Petrarch. We have noted that Petrarch invokes a blessing on the region and the place (*'l bel paese, e 'l loco*) where he was first smitten, a detail which is natural in view of the emphasis which he lays elsewhere in the *Canzoniere* on the scene of his first glimpse of Laura. I have found in earlier *benedetto* and *maledetto* passages no case in which a place is mentioned, and it is therefore tempting to think that Petrarch was the first to add this detail to the conventional invocation of blessings on the time of the poet's first sight of his lady. In any case, while Boccaccio has described at length the scene of the *innamoramento* in the *Filostrato* (i, 18-31), there appears in Troilo's invocation no reference to the place where he first became aware of the power of Criseida's charms. It would seem that if Boccaccio had had Petrarch's sonnet in mind when writing *Filostrato*, iii, 83-85, he would surely have included *il loco* in his enumeration.

II

As Troilo rode through Tróy after the departure of Criseida for the Greek camp every place reminded him of her because of past associations:

Quando sol già per Troia cavalcando,
Ciaschedun luogo gli tornava a mente;
De' quai con seco giva ragionando:
—Quivi rider la vidi lietamente,
Quivi la vidi verso me guardando,
Quivi mi salutò benignamente,
Quivi far festa e quivi star pensosa,
Quivi la vidi a' miei sospir *pietosa*.

Colà istava, quand'ella mi prese
Con gli occhi belli e vaghi con amore;
Colà istava, quand'ella m'accese

Con un sospir di maggior fuoco il core;
 Colà istava, quando condiscese
 Al mio piacere il donnesco valore;
Colà la vidi altera, e là umile
 Mi si mostrò la mia donna gentile [*Fil.*, v, 54-55].¹⁶

That one of Petrarch's sonnets addressed to Sennuccio del Bene "gave Boccaccio material" for these stanzas was regarded as "obvious . . . on comparison of the two passages" by Wilkins in the article above cited. The text of the sonnet follows:

Sennuccio, i' vo' che sapi in qual maniera
 Trattato sono, e qual vita è la mia:
 Ardori e struggo ancor com'io solia;
 L'aura mi volge; e son pur quel ch' i' m'era.
Qui tutta umile, e qui la vidi altera,
 Or aspra, or piana, or dispietata, or pia;
 Or vestirsi onestate, or leggiadria,
 Or mansueta, or disdegnosa e fera;
 Qui cantò dolcemente, e qui s'assise;
 Qui si rivolse, e qui rattenne il passo;
Qui co' begli occhi mi trafisse il core;
 Qui disse una parola, e *qui sorrise;*
 Qui cangiò 'l viso. In questi pensier, lasso!,
 Notte e di tiemmi il signor nostro, Amore [*Canz.*, CXII].

The idea of a lover's seeing his absent lady in his mind's eye in a series of poses against a series of backgrounds just as he had earlier seen her in reality is clearly common to both passages; in the *Filostrato* Troilo is actually making the rounds of the city, while Petrarch goes from place to place only in his imagination. Both passages have in common, moreover, certain details which have been italicized above: the lady is envisaged as (1) smiling or laughing, (2) compassionate, (3) captivating the lover with her fair eyes, and (4) by turns proud and humble. It will be noted at once that these four details are to be found generally in conventional descriptions of the lady in the poetry of the *dolce stil nuovo*.¹⁷ We must recognize at the outset that

¹⁶ The theme and some of the details of these stanzas were used by Chaucer, *Troilus and Criseyde*, V, 561-81, as noted by W. M. Rossetti, *Chaucer's "Troilus and Criseyde"* (from the Harl. Ms. 3943) compared with Boccaccio's "Filostrato" (London, 1873), p. 252.

¹⁷ Thus the first three descriptive details are to be found in the *Vita nuova* or in Dante's *Rime*; Dante also speaks of Beatrice as *umile* but not as *altera*. However, the use of the antonyms together is such an obvious device that it cannot be regarded as evidence of a relationship. Boccaccio frequently uses *altera* or *altiera* referring to Criseida or her actions or qualities: *Filostrato*, I, 19, 8; II, 64, 1; IV, 165, 1; VII, 29, 5; VII, 96, 7.

the presence of four details of this nature in both Boccaccio and Petrarch, even in passages which are closely parallel in another respect, is not sufficient *by itself* to prove that Boccaccio was imitating Petrarch. It could qualify as valid confirmatory evidence for a relationship only if we first established that Boccaccio was indebted to Petrarch for the fundamental idea of the passage. If, on the other hand, we can show that this fundamental idea may have been derived by Boccaccio from another source, the presence of these four details in both Boccaccio and Petrarch must be regarded as of no significance for our problem, for if two poets of the Trecento who were thoroughly familiar with the poetry of their immediate predecessors set out independently to write a fairly lengthy description of a lady it is highly probable that their descriptions would have in common a certain number of conventional details such as these.

Is the fundamental idea of the passage in the *Filostrato* necessarily to be regarded as deriving from Petrarch? If we are to answer this it is not enough to consider the two passages in question, but we must also take into account the facts that Boccaccio used the same idea elsewhere and that he could have derived it from a source other than Petrarch.

That Boccaccio had used the idea of a deserted lover's visiting the places which were associated with the beloved before he wrote *Filostrato*, v, 54-55, was shown by Professor Young,¹⁸ who noted its occurrence in two passages in the *Filocolo*: Biancofiore

andava in tutti quelli luoghi della casa dov' ella si ricordava d'avere già veduto Florio, e tutti gli baciava, e alcuni ne bagnava alcuna volta d' amare lagrime,¹⁹

and subsequently in his letter to her Florio reminded her of this:

Tu rimanesti nelle nostre case visitando i luoghi dove più fiate stati eravamo insieme, e in quelli con sì fatta ricordanza prendevi alcun diletto immaginando.²⁰

¹⁸ K. Young, *The origin and development of the story of Troilus and Criseyde* (London, 1908), pp. 88-89. Young attributes the detail of Biancofiore's visiting the places where she remembered seeing Florio to "Boccaccio's own elaboration" rather than to his sources for the *Filocolo*. He does not envisage the possibility of another source for *Filostrato*, v, 54-55, but holds that these stanzas are "a development of suggestions already present in *Filocolo*," that is to say, of the two passages quoted.

¹⁹ G. Boccaccio, *Il Filocolo*, a cura di S. Battaglia (Bari, 1938), p. 94.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

The theme, moreover, recurs in the Proemio to the *Filostrato*, applied to Boccaccio's own conduct in his lady's absence:

Oh me, quante volte per minor doglia sentire si sono essi [gli occhi miei] spontaneamente ritorti da riguardare li templi e le logge e le piazze e gli altri luoghi ne' quali già vaghi e disiderosi cercavano di vedere, e talvolta lieti videro, la vostra sembianza....²¹

Filostrato, v, 54-55, then, must be considered not merely as an isolated passage which may have been imitated from a similar passage in Petrarch, but as the most careful elaboration of a theme which Boccaccio employed at least four times.

For his repeated use of the theme, Boccaccio could have been inspired by the passages in Ovid in which it occurs, as, of course, could Petrarch.²² Seven such passages can be listed: (1) After Ceyx has sailed away from Trachis, Alcyone seeks out his empty bed and "the bed and the place renew her tears" (*Met.* xi. 471-73), then when he fails to return she goes to the spot on the shore from which she watched him leave and lingers (vss. 710-15), saying to herself:

Hic retinacula solvit,
hoc mihi discedens dedit oscula litore.

(2) Ariadne writes Theseus that she often comes to the bed which he has deserted and recalls times past (*Her.* x. 51-58). (3) Sappho writes Phaon that in her frenzy she often visits the caves and woods which formerly they visited together (*Her.* xv. 141-49). (4) Hero, during the absence of Leander, looks to see whether his footprints are still on the sand and kisses the garments which he has laid aside on entering the water (*Her.* xix. 27-28 and 31-32). (5) Ovid himself in exile pictures his wife as bending over his face as if he were present at home and imagines that she is stirred on beholding the bed which he has left (*Trist.* iv. 3. 19-24). (6) Tarquin recalls the appearance of Lucretia

²¹ Pernicone ed., p. 5. This account serves to remind us that Boccaccio was writing the *Filostrato* while his lady was absent from Naples and still faithful to him (if not in fact, at least according to the fiction which the author wished his readers to believe), and one of his objects, according to the Proemio, was to show how painful it is for a lover (Boccaccio-Troilo) not to be able to look upon his lady (Fiammetta-Criseida). As *Filostrato*, v, 54-55 contributes to Boccaccio's development of this important point, it must not be regarded as merely episodic or incidental.

²² Ovidian influence has been remarked elsewhere in the *Filostrato*. While he minimizes this, Savj-Lopez (p. 477) notes three reminiscences of the *Heroides*; reminiscences of *Remedia amoris* will be pointed out below. Further study of the poem would probably add other examples.

when he returns to camp after having been smitten by her charms (*Fasti* ii. 769-74). (7) Ovid advises one who would put an end to his love affair to flee the scenes of his joy for there he will surely recall his lady (*Rem. am.* 725-28).²³

Having established the fact that ideas similar to that expressed by Boccaccio and Petrarch occur repeatedly in Ovid, we must devote more detailed attention to the last two citations, which, with the verse and a half quoted above from *Metamorphoses* xi, are the only Ovidian passages among those listed which have the rhetorical device of repetition of an adverb or demonstrative so obviously emphasized in both Boccaccio and Petrarch. The text of the passage noted in *Fasti* follows:

Carpitur adtonitos absentis imagine sensus
 ille. recordanti plura magisque placent:
 "sic sedit, sic culta fuit, sic stamina nevit,
 neglectae collo sic iacuere comae,
 hos habuit voltus, haec illi verba fuerunt,
 hic color, haec facies, hic decor oris erat"

[*Fasti* ii. 769-74].

While we must recognize that Petrarch was familiar with many if not all of the other Ovidian passages listed above, editors of the *Canzoniere* (Carducci, Scherillo, Chiòrboli) are probably correct in citing these verses as the particular inspiration of verses 5-13 of the sonnet to Sennuccio, for in both a lover is described as recalling in his thoughts the various attitudes of the lady. The passage in *Remedia amoris*, a poem which was fresh in Boccaccio's mind while he was writing the *Filostrato* as other evidence shows,²⁴ seems to have closer affinity with Boccaccio's treatment of the theme in *Filostrato*, v, 54-55; here Ovid, after

²³ Cf. also Ovid's warning that solitude should be avoided by the lover, *Remedia amoris* 583-84:

"Tristis eris, si solus eris, dominaeque relictae
 ante oculos facies stabit, ut ipsa, tuos."

²⁴ Wilkins shows, in his article "Criseida," *MLN*, XXIV (1909), 65-67, that *Remedia amoris* 467-72 is one of the two classical sources of knowledge about Criseida which Boccaccio could have known and that Boccaccio's conclusion that Calcas was the name of her father was almost certainly due to his misinterpretation of that passage. Professor R. K. Root points out in his edition of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* (Princeton, 1926), in notes to IV, 414-15 and IV, 421-24, that the quotation in *Filostrato*, iv, 49, 2 is found in *Remedia amoris* 462 and that with *Filostrato*, iv, 59 may be compared *Remedia amoris* 139-44, 149-50, 205-6, 214-40.

advising the lover who is seeking a remedy against passion to destroy his lady's picture, even though it is mute, goes on:

et loca muta nocent; fugito loca conscia vestri
 concubitus; causas illa doloris habent.
 "hic fuit, hic cubuit; thalamo dormivimus illo:
 hic mihi lasciva gaudia nocte dedit"

[*Rem. am.* 725-28].

In these verses it is a question of the lover's actually visiting a place or places where he has enjoyed his lady's favors, and we have seen that in the cases of Biancofiore and Troilo, in contradistinction to Petrarch, an actual visit to places associated with past memories is involved.

Since Boccaccio must have read passages involving the fundamental theme of *Filostrato*, v, 54-55 in Ovid, and since the theme appears in *Remedia amoris* in a form closely parallel to his treatment of it, it seems proper to regard *Filostrato*, v, 54-55 as deriving from Ovid rather than from Petrarch. The appearance of certain details in both Boccaccio and Petrarch, by their very nature as shown above, cannot be regarded as evidence of a relationship if the indebtedness of Boccaccio to Petrarch for the fundamental theme is not established. Thus we cannot unreservedly accept President Wilkins' view that Petrarch's sonnet "gave Boccaccio material" for *Filostrato*, v, 54-55.

In this paper I have sought to establish the point that the imitation of Petrarch by Boccaccio in the two cases considered has not been proved. It remains possible, of course, that Boccaccio did imitate Petrarch. On the other hand, while the fundamental themes in each case are closely parallel, Boccaccio and Petrarch may well have derived them independently from other sources, and the similarities in detail observable in both parallel passages are not such as to constitute in themselves proof of a relationship. Thus, in neither of the cases of alleged imitation in the *Filostrato* is the conclusion that Boccaccio was certainly imitating Petrarch justified, particularly in view of the absence of independent evidence that Boccaccio knew Italian poems of Petrarch by 1338.

UNION COLLEGE

MALORY, THE STANZAIC MORTE ARTHUR, AND THE MORT ARTU

ROBERT H. WILSON

BOTH the English stanzaic *Morte Arthur* of MS Harl. 2252 (MH)¹ and Books XVIII, XX, and XXI of Malory's *Morte Darthur* (M)² present versions of the *Mort Artu* section of the French Lancelot-Grail cycle (MA).³ But whereas Malory's Book XVIII and the corresponding section of MH, lines 1-1671, vary markedly from each other as well as from MA, Books XX-XXI and lines 1672 ff. show close correspondences, both in episodes in the story in which they depart from MA, and in verbal parallels. Yet, as against the obvious explanation that MH was Malory's source for these last two books, there stand a number of small points in which M and MA agree against MH. There remain, then, two other possible explanations:

First: M is derived from both MA and MH. This hypothesis was offered in tentative and unconvincing form by Sommer early in his "Studies." Books XX-XXI, he states, are essentially a prose version of MH, but MA "may occasionally also have been used."⁴

Second: M and MH have a lost common source, a French modification of MA, which explains both their correspondences in narrative and the points where each agrees with MA against the other. The verbal parallels may be the result of mere coincidence in close rendering of this common original, or may mean that Malory occasionally consulted MH as well as its lost source. This common source hypothesis is held by Sommer toward the end of his "Studies,"⁵ by

¹ Ed. J. Douglas Bruce, *Le Morte Arthur*, E.E.T.S., E.S., No. LXXXVIII (London, 1903).

² Ed. H. Oskar Sommer, *Le Morte Darthur by Syr Thomas Malory* (London, 1889-91), Vol. I.

³ Ed. H. Oskar Sommer, *The Vulgate version of the Arthurian romances* (Washington, 1909-16), VI, 203 ff.

⁴ *Morte Darthur*, Vol. III: "Studies on the sources," p. 11.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 249 ff.; also "On Dr. Douglas Bruce's article: 'The Middle English romance "Le Morte Arthur," Harl. MS. 2252,' etc.," *Anglia*, XXIX (1906), 529-38.

Bruce⁶ and Mead,⁷ and in briefer treatment by Wechssler,⁸ Wells,⁹ and Vinaver.¹⁰ Their principal difference (and the only serious point at issue in the acrimonious exchange of publications between Bruce and Sommer, outside of the latter's inconsistencies and confusions in the "Studies" and his refusal to admit them) concerns the verbal parallels. Wechssler pays no attention to them; Sommer and Wells hold that they represent borrowings; but Bruce, Mead, and Vinaver believe that they are coincidences.

Bruce's contentions lack unity of presentation as a result of being published piecemeal, with a distortion of emphasis imposed by the controversy with Sommer. He brings out, however, most of what can be said for a belief in a common source and coincidental verbal parallels. Rearranged into the logical series upon which depends what cogency they possess, his arguments run as follows:

a) M frequently adds to the story details not to be found in MH or MA. Bruce is unwilling to ascribe these to originality on the part of Malory, who in general follows his sources closely and compresses rather than expands them. Hence such details must be evidence that Malory had a lost source which supplied them. Then, since the cross-agreements of M, MH, and MA have also to be explained, it is the simplest hypothesis that this lost source of Malory's was a modification of MA providing a common source for M and MH, presumably in French. (An interesting piece of evidence that Malory had a French source is provided by Vinaver.)¹¹

b) If all the agreements in narrative between M and MH are thus to be explained by derivation from a common source, and Malory did not actually turn to MH for narrative material as he had to the alliterative *Morte Arthure* when writing Book V, it is most unlikely that he would have gone to it for mere phraseology. Surely the verbal

⁶ *Le Morte Arthur*, pp. xiii-xx; "The Middle English metrical romance 'Le Morte Arthur' (Harleian MS. 2252): its sources and its relation to Sir Thomas Malory's 'Morte Darthur,'" *Anglia*, XXIII (1901), 67-100; "A reply to Dr. Sommer," *Anglia*, XXX (1907), 209-16.

⁷ William Edward Mead, *Selections from Sir Thomas Malory's Morte Darthur* (Boston, 1897), pp. 293-95, 305-10.

⁸ Eduard Wechssler, *Ueber die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus* (Halle, 1895), p. 36. Wechssler's theory is that the common source is also the source of MA rather than a derivative from it. But the difference is irrelevant to the course of the present argument.

⁹ John Edwin Wells, *A manual of the writings in Middle English* (New Haven, 1926), p. 49.

¹⁰ Eugène Vinaver, *Malory* (Oxford, 1929), pp. 150-53.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 151-52.

parallels can better be explained by coincidence in translation (for the probability of which Bruce refers to Mead's study, particularly the evidence of parallels in two English versions of the *Merlin*).¹²

c) Some inferences can now be drawn as to the source of lines 1-1671 of MH. Their extremely free rendering of the story of MA cannot be ascribed to the author of the English poem, who in lines 1672 ff. follows closely (*ex hypothesi*) his and Malory's common source. Therefore they must have as source yet another hypothetical French modification of MA.

In this summary Bruce's detailed evidence has been omitted because it is of secondary importance compared with the presupposition upon which the argument rests: that it is more probable that an English author followed a single French source mechanically than that he had the originality either to invent details or to use two sources at once. This presupposition is so strong in Bruce's mind, and seemingly in the minds of the other advocates of the common-source hypothesis, as to outweigh the logical objection to a multiplication of hypothetical sources. And because the common-source hypothesis is thus not contingent upon specific facts, but is put forward as a more probable explanation of a body of circumstances which *might* be explained otherwise, it is hard to test objectively. The source is not available for checking, and can be made by its advocates to contain just such details as are necessary to explain any difficulties which may appear. This is even possible with the verbal parallels, as when in one case Vinaver reconstructs a source sentence so worded as to explain the readings of both M and MH.¹³

Accordingly, skepticism of the hypothesis, like advocacy of it, must be in terms of probability. If it can be shown that belief in a common source involves so many difficulties, requiring so many details in the source hypothesized *ad hoc*, that the final array of peculiarities just fitting the difficulties would represent a nearly incredible piling up of coincidences, then even those who consider the hypothesis antecedently probable must abandon it.

One large class of such difficulties lies in the relationship between Malory and lines 1-1671 of MH. Bruce alone devotes any extended consideration to the possibility of there being a connection in spite of the large differences in the general outlines of this part of MH and

¹² Mead, pp. 305-10.

¹³ Malory, pp. 150-51.

Malory's Book XVIII; but he claims to have proved the two texts independent by listing small points in the narrative in which MH agrees with MA against M.¹⁴ A real demonstration of independence, however, would have to include a proof that there are no agreements of M and MH against MA. Such proof Bruce makes no effort to present, and in fact mentions one such agreement in passing without any sign of realizing that it weighs against his conclusions.¹⁵ Now there are (as Sommer indicates early in his "Studies" without developing the point)¹⁶ a considerable number of such agreements, enumerated below:

1. In MH and M it becomes known to the other knights that Bors has agreed to fight for the Queen, and he is criticized; whereas in MA there is no such episode.¹⁷

2. In MH and M Bors is ready in armor to fight Mador when Lancelot appears, whereas in MA he is an unobtrusive part of the waiting crowd.¹⁸

3. When Lancelot has defeated Mador and saved Guenevere, MH and M mention that she almost sinks to the ground in her emotion; MA does not.¹⁹

4. In MH "Yonge Galehod," in M "Galahaut the haute pryncce," is a prominent figure in the plans for the tournament at Winchester, and again in the actual fighting. In MA he does not appear, as is natural since he died far back in the story of the complete cycle.²⁰

5. In MA, Lancelot, wishing to attend this tournament at Winchester incognito, stays behind on the excuse that he is indisposed, then goes to the Queen for her permission to leave, which she grants readily. In MH he is really ill, but is also said to stay behind for the Queen's love; she, however, is uneasy when they meet, and makes him go (although in their conversation there is preserved a relic of the MA version when Lancelot tells her that he has come to take his leave). In M he is apparently sincere in his excuse that his wounds are unhealed, but the Queen calls him to her and makes him go.²¹

6. In MH and M, Lancelot and his young companion wait in the

¹⁴ *Le Morte Arthur*, pp. xvi-xvii, xix; *Anglia*, XXIII, 75-81.

¹⁵ *Anglia*, XXIII, 88.

¹⁶ "Studies," p. 10.

¹⁸ MH, p. 45; M, p. 734; MA, p. 266.

¹⁷ MH, p. 42; M, pp. 732-33; MA, p. 266.

¹⁹ MH, p. 48; M, p. 737; MA, p. 269.

²⁰ MH, pp. 2, 8-9; M, pp. 738, 742, 748; MA, pp. 204-5, 210 ff. Cf. also, for the death of Galahalt, Sommer, *Vulgate version*, IV, 155.

²¹ MH, pp. 2-3; M, pp. 738-39; MA, pp. 205-6.

background at the tournament and go into action only when the opposition party, which they have planned to join, begins to lose ground. In MA they enter the fighting immediately upon their arrival.²²

7. In MH a group of knights, in M, Gawain, tells Arthur that the unknown hero of the tournament would seem to be Lancelot except that he wears the sleeve. In MA there are two conversations between Gawain and Arthur about the hero's identity, but the sleeve is not mentioned; Gawain says it cannot be Lancelot because he has been left at Camelot.²³

8. In MH and M the following tournament is to be at Winchester; in MA, at Taneborc.²⁴

9. In MH and M it is stated that Guenevere, on hearing about the Maid, goes nearly mad; in MA this is not mentioned.²⁵

10. In MH and M when Lancelot returns to court he is welcomed by Arthur and Gawain. In MA there is no such welcome, since Arthur is away at Morgan's castle learning of Lancelot's infidelity and Gawain has come home along with Lancelot.²⁶

These agreements establish the existence of a connection of some sort between Book XVIII of M and lines 1-1671 of MH. There are also signs of a connection between this first part of MH and its conclusion.

A characteristic of the first part of MH pointed out by Bruce²⁷ is carelessness with its *dramatis personae*. Galahalt, as has been noted above, is introduced into the story long after his death. "Evwayne" is substituted for Gifflet in a conversation with Arthur,²⁸ and Ector is substituted for Bors as wounding Lancelot.²⁹ But what Bruce fails to note is that strikingly similar instances of recasting occur in the second part of MH, and likewise in the corresponding passages of M. Bagdemagus, dead previously in the cycle, is introduced as an important figure in a conference of Lancelot and his followers which is nonexistent in MA.³⁰ Bedevere is substituted for Gifflet as Arthur's last companion.³¹ And Ector and Bors trade places in the story of

²² MH, p. 9; M, pp. 742-43; MA, pp. 210-11.

²³ MH, p. 10; M, p. 743; MA, pp. 211-12.

²⁴ MH, p. 11; M, p. 755; MA, p. 215.

²⁷ *Anglia*, XXIII, 99 n.

²⁵ MH, p. 21; M, p. 751; MA, pp. 220-21.

²⁸ MH, p. 4; MA, p. 207.

²⁶ MH, p. 23; M, p. 759; MA, pp. 238-43.

²⁹ MH, pp. 10 ff.; MA, pp. 211 ff.

³⁰ MH, p. 77; M, p. 831. Cf. MA, p. 319, and for the death of Bagdemagus, p. 204.

³¹ MH, pp. 103 ff.; M, pp. 846 ff.; MA, pp. 377 ff.

their search for Lancelot; where one finds him with the hermit and lives with him, the other arrives only in time for his burial.³²

In view of both these classes of evidence, Bruce's separation of two independent sources for the first and last portions of MH would appear unfounded. If there is an intermediate French source between MA and MH, it must be the same for the entire poem; and then some further complications of hypothetical textual history must explain why so many of its changes were transmitted to Books XX-XXI but so few to Book XVIII. If, however, the alterations in MH are those of the English poet working freely with MA, Malory may easily have drawn more or less on MH, to supplement MA, as his fancy struck him.

Again, although it is true that many of the verbal parallels in Books XX-XXI cited by Sommer are so weak as to be easily explainable by coincidence in translation, two considerations weigh heavily against so explaining all of them. One is the fact that the really close parallels tend to appear in places where the narrative of M and MH departs from that of MA. Such a distribution is exactly what one should expect if Malory were turning aside from MA to pick up, not mere phrases, but narrative details for his story, taking over many words in the process. But it is otherwise to be explained only by a series of coincidences.³³

The two outstanding instances of this distribution of verbal parallels are the conference of Lancelot and his followers in Gannes as to whether to stand a siege or sally forth, and the last interview between Lancelot and Guenevere, neither of which is to be found at all in MA. Likewise, in a number of shorter passages verbal parallels accompany slight departures from the narrative of MA.

1. In the conference, Malory follows closely the substance of the successive speeches of Lionel, Bagdemagus, Galihud, and the seven brethren of Northgalis; and in each of the first three speeches there are to be found verbal parallels:

MH	M
And shredde them downe as shepe in folde.	And shrede hem doune as shepe in a felde.
Yiff that they ouer oure landys Ryde	And they thus ouer our landes ryde /

³² MH, pp. 116 ff.; M, pp. 856 ff.; MA, pp. 388 ff.

³³ Wells, p. 49, declares that "close resemblances in phrasing at points where there is no original in the French, indicate that probably Malory was acquainted with the English poem." But he presents no detailed evidence, and fails to consider that this distribution militates against the common source theory, which he holds.

All to noght they myght vs brynge,
Whyle we in holys here vs hyde.

they shalle by processe brynge vs alle
to noughte whyles we thus in holes
vs hyde.

Syr, here are knyghtis of kynges
blode
That longe wylle not droupe And
dare.

Syre here ben knyghtes come of
kynges blood that wyl not longe
droupe.³⁴

2. In the conversation of Lancelot and Guenevere the parallels are practically continuous:

MH

I-sette I am in suche A place,
my sowle hele I wyll A-byde,
Telle god send me som grace
.
After to haue A syght of hys face
At domys day on hys Ryght syde
Ther-fore, syr lancelot du lake,
For my loue now I the pray,
my company thow Aye for-sake
And to thy kyngdome thow take thy
way;
And kepe thy Reme from werre and
wrake,
And take A wyffe with her to play.
.
Now, swete madame, that wold I not
doo.

M

I am sette in suche a plyte to gete my
soule hele / & yet I truste thorough
goddess grace that after my deth to
haue a syght of the blessyd face of
cryst / and at domes day to sytte on
his ryght syde . . . therfore syr
Launcelot . . . I comande the on
goddess behalfe that thou forsake my
companye & to thy kyngdom thou
torne ageyn & kepe wel thy royaume
from warre & wrake . . . and there
take the a wyf & lyue with hir. . .
Now swete madam . . . that shal I
neuer do.³⁵

3. In MH and M Lancelot, returning after Agravain's attempt to trap him and the Queen, finds Bors and the others armed. Asking the reason, he is informed:

MH

"Syr," sayd bors the hardy knyght
.
"Owre knyghtis haue be drechyd
to-nyght,
That som nakyd oute of bed spronge."

M

Sir sayd sir Bors after ye were de-
parted . . . we . . . were soo dretched
that somme of vs lepte oute of oure
beddes naked.

In MA they are not armed, and there is no such dialogue.³⁶

³⁴ MH, pp. 77-78; M, p. 831. MA, pp. 318-19, contains no such conference, and the wasting of Lancelot's lands, discussed in MH and M, has not taken place.

³⁵ MH, pp. 111-12; M, p. 854. In MA, p. 834, Guenevere dies without ever seeing Lancelot.

³⁶ MH, p. 55; M, p. 803; MA, p. 276.

4. Whereas in MA there is only polite conversation between Lancelot and Arthur during the siege of Gannes, in MH and M Lancelot once half insultingly asks Arthur to raise the siege:

MH

M

But have good day, my lord the
kyng
.
ye wyne no worshyp at thys walle;
And I wold my knyghtis oute brynge.

Now haue good day my lord the kyng
for wyt you wel ye wyne no worshyp
at this wallys / & yf I wold my
knyghtes oute brynge. . . .³⁷

5. In Bedevere's first reply to Arthur, MH and M agree in having him refer to seeing waves and winds, whereas in MA Gifflet says he saw "*riens se bien non*." In his second reply MH more or less follows the MA "*ie ne vi riens que ie ne deusse*," but M repeats the waves and winds remark with a verbal parallel:

MH

M

nothyng
But watres depe And wawes wanne.
Sertys, syr, I saw nought.

No thyng but wawes and wyndes.
I sawe no thyng but the waters
wappe and wawes wanne.³⁸

6. In MA Gifflet spends the night after Arthur's departure on the shore, then stays two days with a hermit in a little wood, then finally goes to the chapel. In MH and M:

MH

M

Whan the shypp from the land was
brought,
Syr bedwere saw of hem no more;
Throw the forest forthe he soughte
.
All nyght he went wepyng sore;
A-gaynste the day he fownde ther
wrought
A chapelle by-twene ij holtes hore.

Assone as syr Bedwere had loste the
syght of the baarge he wepte and
waylled and so took the foreste / and
so he wente al that nyght / and in
the mornyng he was ware betwyxte
two holtes hore af a chapel and an
ermytage.³⁹

7. In connection with Lancelot's sickness and death, MH and M give two remarks not found in MA. Lancelot is told in reply to his premonition of death:

MH

M

Hyt ys bot hevynesse of pover blode. It is but hevynesse of your blood.

³⁷ MH, p. 86; M, p. 836; MA, p. 343.

³⁸ MH, pp. 105, 106; M, pp. 848, 849; MA, p. 380.

³⁹ MH, p. 107; M, p. 850; MA, pp. 381-82.

And the Archbishop, in reply to his dream of Lancelot's death, is told:

MH

Syr lancelot eylythe no-thyng but
gode.

M

Syr Launcelot ayleth no thyng but
good.⁴⁰

In contrast, there is only one close parallel of wording where a matching passage in MA can be found, and even in this case it so happens, as will be seen presently, that there are peculiarities which make it difficult to believe that the English resemblances come entirely from translation.

These peculiarities involve the second consideration referred to above: that MH and M show similarities of wording which, unlike anything in Mead's examples from the *Merlin* translations,⁴¹ involve something other than meaning and hence cannot be explained (except as more coincidences) on the basis of a common foreign original. In two instances M gives words similar in appearance to the English words in MH although different in meaning: in case (1) above, "felde" for "folde"; in case (2), "plyte" for "place." Other instances involve reproduction in M of features of the verse structure of MH. "Ouer our landes ryde" and "vs hyde" in (1), "my knyghtes oute brynge" in (4), "wawes wanne" in (5), "holtes hore" in (6), and "Syr Launcelot ayleth no thyng" in (7) all show inverted word order. This is not, to be sure, so strikingly abnormal in Middle English as in Modern, but still it would be a notable coincidence if in all the cases Malory had just happened to use the arrangement which also suited the versifier's purpose. The two speeches in (7) are both entire metrical lines without a word altered; and nearly the same thing is true of one line in (5), of three in the short passage of (4), and of three scattered through (1). Again, the probabilities are strongly against coincidental parallels being of just this metrically determined length and arrangement of words. And finally, the instance referred to in the previous paragraph, where a French original can be compared, involves a matter of rhyme.

In MA, after Lancelot has spared Arthur in the fight before Joyous Garde, the latter returns to his army and speaks to them:

Or a il passe de debonairete & de courtoisie tos les cheualiers dont iou oisse onques mais parler. Ore voldroie iou bien se diex me consaut que ceste guerre neust onques este commenchie.

⁴⁰ MH, pp. 117, 118; M, pp. 858, 859; MA, p. 389.

⁴¹ P. 310.

In MH and M these remarks occur on the battlefield:

MH

Whan the kyng was horsyd there,
 Launcelot lokys he vpon,
 How corteise was in hym more
 Then euyr was in Any man;
 He thought on thyngis that had bene
 ore,
 The teres from hys yzen Ranne;
 He Sayde "Allas!" with syghynge
 sore,
 "That euyr yit thys werre be-gan!"
 The parties arne with-drawen A-
 waye.

M

Thenne whan kyng Arthur was on
 horsbak / he loked vpon syr launce-
 lot / & thēne the teres brast out of
 his eyen / thynkyng on the grete
 curtosy that was in syr laūcelot more
 than in any other man / & therwith
 the Kyng rode his wey / & myghte
 no lenger beholde hym / & sayd
 Allas that euer this werre began / &
 thēne eyther partyes of the batails
 withdrewe them.⁴²

Not only do the passages in MH and M contain details not to be found in MA, and verbal resemblances in their expression. Where the French is available for comparison, the rendering of "cheualiers" by "man" and that of "eust ... este commenchie" by "began," although both are only slight alterations of meaning natural enough in free translation, fit too patly into the rhyme-scheme of the poem for it to sound very convincing that Malory made them independently. Nor is similar fortuitous alteration in an intermediate French source any more probable.

Then in addition to the two large classes of evidence already presented—correspondences with the narrative of MH in Book XVIII of M, and verbal resemblances in Books XX-XXI—there exist two cases where M shows contradictory resemblances to both MH and MA which are easily explainable if Malory was drawing on both texts, but hard to imagine existing side by side in a common source of MH and M.

In Book XVIII, as cited earlier, MH and M agree that the second tournament is to be likewise at Winchester, not at Tanebore as in MA. But M also states, as is not to be found in MH, that this tournament is to be "betwixe kyng Arthur and the kyng of Northgalys." Now MA provides the ultimate source of this information. In it Arthur proclaims that the tournament is to be held at Tanebore, "vns chastiaus ... a lentree de norgales." Later in the story a group of

⁴² MH, pp. 65-66; M, p. 819; MA, p. 306.

knights hunting Lancelot stop at a castle near Tanebore, and the King of Norgales, who lives near by, comes to see them and asks them to be on his side in the tournament against Arthur. But in the account of the tournament itself his name is not given (as it is in M).⁴³ Thus the information of his participation in the tournament is presented only indirectly, and is intimately connected with its location at Tanebore. It would be difficult to reconstruct a hypothetical modification of MA which would retain the king while changing the place of the tournament.

There is a parallel instance in Book XX. MA provides an extended account of Gawain's marvelous recovery of strength at noon during his battle with Lancelot, and of its origin: the holy man who baptized him did so at noon, and then obtained by his prayers the miracle that Gawain should be so "gracieu" as always to be revived at that hour. MH omits all details about the holy man, and is thus able without inconsistency to describe Gawain's strength as gradually increasing *until* noon. Now M, as pointed out by Bruce,⁴⁴ reproduces from the detailed account in MA the comment that Lancelot thinks Gawain "a fende and none erthely man." But otherwise it follows the MH version:

MH

Than had syr gawayne suche a grace,
An holy man had boddyn that bone.
.
Hys strength shuld wex in suche
A space,
From the vndyr-tyme tylle none.

M

Thenne had Syr Gauwayn suche a
grace and gyfte that an holy man had
gyuen to hym That euery day in the
yere from vnderne tyl hyhe none hys
myght encreaced tho thre houres.⁴⁵

The verbal resemblances alone are not of much weight, since the only distinctive expression, "grace," is paralleled in the French "gracieu"; but the precise correspondence in details is just what one would expect if Malory were working directly from the poem. On the other hand, a French intermediate version detailed enough to contain the statement about Lancelot's thoughts would presumably have contained the baptism account as well, and so have been in no position to change the time of the increase in strength.

⁴³ MH, p. 11 (pp. 13-14, the tournament is called off); M, pp. 755, 757; MA, pp. 215, 225, 230.

⁴⁴ *Anglia*, XXIII, 73.

⁴⁵ MH, pp. 84-85; M, p. 835; MA, pp. 339-41.

What has then, it is hoped, been demonstrated is that the hypothesis of a common French source for MH, lines 1672 ff., and M, Books XX-XXI, as accounting for the agreements of M with both MH and MA—an hypothesis developed not so much to explain these agreements as to explain away the obvious impression that Malory used both MH and MA and added what is not in either—in fact brings up more difficulties than it can eliminate. Such a hypothetical intermediary must have been the source of all of MH, not just the latter portion; and it must have been reproduced faithfully by the compiler of an immediate French source of M in the portion of the story providing Books XX-XXI, while in that providing Book XVIII it was relied upon only for occasional hints in the revision of MA. In the portion providing Books XX-XXI the common source must have contained just such details and words as would explain the numerous correspondences of M and MH in small details and in phraseology—including the details of the time of Gawain's restoration which would be contradicted in a full version of the MA story, and bits of wording so arranged that their translation would fit into the pattern of English verse. And, finally, Malory and the MH poet must have translated their source in such a manner as to show their closest correspondences in wording precisely where their source departed from MA.

A theory involving so many such improbabilities, if indeed some of them are not to be called absurdities, cannot logically be considered a plausible explanation, and must fall of its own weight regardless of any supposed antecedent probability. The only explanation remaining is, then, that Malory drew upon MH itself as one of his sources, and that it in turn represents an original treatment, by the English poet, of MA substantially as we know it. Nor does either of these propositions appear unreasonable.

Once one abandons the belief that correspondences of M with MH show faithful reproduction in the latter of a common source, the second part of the poem is seen to display as great freedom of treatment as the first. The two parts are likewise tied together by similar alterations of the *dramatis personae* which, along with those narrative alterations contradicting the full MA story, would be more natural to

the author of a compressed poem than to that of a full-length French modification of MA.⁴⁶

Malory's use of the two sources can most easily be understood on the assumption that he at first followed MA (or some modification of it responsible for re-arranging the events of Book XVIII as well as inserting those of Book XIX) rather systematically. But he likewise drew on his memory of MH and in time consulted a copy—on occasion following it closely where, in Books XX–XXI, its version of the story is strikingly different, yet still always keeping MA before him as his primary source. Memory (of which there are some definite signs, such as the misplaced verbal parallel on Bedevere in example 5)⁴⁷ could explain most if not all of the correspondences in fact in Book XVIII, and even many of the shorter and weaker verbal parallels in Books XX–XXI. Direct copying, on the other hand, would account for the closer agreements.

The question of Malory's original authorship of the touches found in neither MH nor MA does not strictly concern the present investigation except in the one point of Lancelot's vision of Guenevere's approaching death, and his burying her. This is the very one of the twelve additions Bruce cites from Books XX–XXI which he feels is "quite beyond Malory's capacity for independent invention."⁴⁸ According to Bruce, the common source agreed with Malory in this episode as well as the last interview of the lovers, whereas the author

⁴⁶ Minor variation among individual texts of a romance like MA must always be considered. If the opening of MH, pp. 1–2, which differs from the parallel account in MA, pp. 204–5, in the two respects that the Winchester tournament comes not immediately at the end of the Quest but only after a four-year interval in which the prestige of Arthur's court has been declining, and that it is inspired by a conversation between Arthur and Guenevere, owes these similarities to the opening of the *Perlesvaus* (ed. William A. Nitze and T. Atkinson Jenkins [Chicago, 1932–37], I, 25–27) to borrowing from it and not to coincidence, it is perhaps more plausible to believe that the borrowing was made by the copyist of a French MS rather than by the English poet. Similarly, any given small alteration may have been the work of a French copyist. But there seems to be no reason to believe, without evidence, that any appreciable number of the changes in fact were.

⁴⁷ Similarly, not only does M, p. 836, reproduce from MH, p. 85, the detail that Gawain in his first battle with Lancelot falls on his side (in MA, p. 342, he stays on his feet), but the detail is repeated in the second battle, M, p. 838, where it does not occur in MH, p. 88 (in MA, ca. p. 347, there is no second battle). The statement of the hermit, M, p. 850, that the ladies "offeryd an hondred tapers and they gaf me an hondred besautes," seems derived in part from his statement in MH, p. 108, that they offered a hundred pounds' worth of besants, but also in part, by memory, from the earlier description in MH, p. 107, of a hundred tapers burning at the tomb (MA, p. 382, contains neither of the details).

⁴⁸ *Anglia*, XXIII, 71.

of MH further postponed Guenevere's death until after that of Lancelot.⁴⁹ But if one has rejected the common-source hypothesis, the inference seems irresistible that the burial scene in M, a logical sequel to the interview as taken over from MH, did not come to Malory coincidentally through an independent modification of MA, but was his own invention. Nor would such an invention, with an approximate source in the MH episode of the rest of the knights burying Guenevere, and a further suggestion in Lancelot's anticipation, and the Archbishop's vision, of Lancelot's death, require any great degree of originality.

Then if Malory did invent the burial scene, the lesser additions which Bruce cites⁵⁰ and a good many more which he does not, for the most part extended speeches developing the characters of Lancelot and Arthur, may easily be original as well. And so likewise may be some of the alterations and additions in Book XVIII. Malory's general faithfulness to his sources, and tendency to compress, need have been no bar to changes serving a specific purpose, particularly in the highly significant passages at the end of the story.⁵¹

HOWARD COLLEGE

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70; also *Le Morte Arthur*, pp. xiv-xv.

⁵¹ For an extended argument that these alterations, and others all through the *Morte Darthur* involving characterization, should be ascribed to Malory's originality because they show the same tendencies of characterization appearing throughout the work regardless of source, see the present author, *Characterization in Malory: a comparison with his sources* (University of Chicago diss., typewritten, 1932; "essential portion" published, Chicago, 1934). Even without such an argument, however, it would seem reasonable to be skeptical of the attitude of Bruce as discussed, of Sommer's frequent ascription in his "Studies" of all changes to lost intermediate sources, and of Vinaver's statement (p. 41) that "the great story-teller was seemingly incapable of creating a story; and even though a certain portion of the *Morte Darthur* has not yet been traced to any definite source, it is hard to believe that he himself invented any of its episodes." For their contention, reasonable enough as regards large insertions of material like the story of Gareth in Book VII, need not necessarily apply to smaller alterations.

LE PRETENDU REALISME DE RABELAIS¹

LEO SPITZER

LES ROMANTIQUES français, sincères ou inavoués, avaient regardé Rabelais du point de vue anti-classique. Chateaubriand avait dit: "un de ces génies-mères qui semblent avoir enfanté et allaité tous les autres," en appliquant une métaphore d'une saveur elle-même rabelaisienne au créateur des géantes Badebec, Gargamelle, Antiphysie. A celui que Nodier avait appelé un "Homère bouffon," Victor Hugo avait donné un fond noir dans le goût des contrastes hugoliens: "son éclat de rire énorme est un des gouffres de l'esprit," Rabelais aurait, selon Hugo et comme Hugo, une "bouche d'ombre." Flaubert imite les constructions tripartites chères à Maître François en l'appelant "l'immense, sacrosaint et extrabeau Rabelais," et Balzac le pastiche dans les *Contes drôlatiques*, dont le titre renoue l'étrange alliance entre le recherché et la plaisanterie débraillée. Tous ces poètes de l'énorme et du bizarre, qui représentent dans la littérature française l'élément vital, sans transposition ni stylisation classique, jettent en arrière des regards de nostalgie furtive vers un genre de poésie mort pour une France ayant appris à raffiner la vitalité gauloise: Voltaire, gauloisant mais classique, vital mais sophistiqué, a tué Rabelais; après lui ce qui n'est ni fin ni intellectuel n'est plus français, et Rabelais est relégué dans les archives nationales, dans le musée des curiosités.

Voilà que vers le début de notre siècle l'histoire littéraire de l'école positiviste s'est emparé de cette gloire soi-disant délabrée, avec l'esprit de complétude qui juge que tout ce qui a vécu doit être exhumé et expliqué, avec cet esprit scientifique qui accepte toute réalité comme matière d'études, quitte à ignorer la véritable raison de sa préférence de tel sujet. Et voilà qu'autour d'Abel Lefranc mûrissent à peu près 30 volumes de revues d'études rabelaisiennes, une précieuse édition

¹ Texte inaltéré d'une conférence faite au congrès de la MLA à Chicago en 1937. L'auteur a remanié et changé plusieurs idées émises dans une ébauche publiée en allemand dans *Romanische Stil- und Literaturstudien*, I (Bonn, 1931), où on trouvera des indications bibliographiques.

critique commentée, une biographie, l'inventaire des sources et du vocabulaire—toutes œuvres d'érudition prodigieuse, non pas de critique littéraire, qui n'insistent pas sur le génie-mère, la bouche d'ombre, l'extrabeau Rabelais, mais sur le fait palpable et réel qui pouvait en déterminer l'imagination. On découvrit les rapports avec la biographie et l'histoire de l'époque du conteur, avec son pays d'origine, la Touraine, où il a placé la scène de ses contes: le château de Grandgousier se trouve à la Devinière, près de Chinon, possession du père de Rabelais; la guerre picrocholine est une réplique d'un procès de ce père; les lieux nommés dans ces chapitres forment une carte complète du pays où le poète a passé son adolescence; les navigations de Pantagruel et de Panurge s'inspirent du soi-disant tour du monde d'un Jacques Cartier; les plaisanteries et les entretiens de Panurge roulent autour de questions d'actualité (querelle humaniste sur la valeur de la femme); les litanies de mots énumérant des jeux, des costumes, des titres de livres baroques ne sont pas des produits de l'imagination, mais des citations, ou au moins des allusions satiriques à des jeux, costumes, livres de l'époque; si Rabelais, pour nous signifier que Diogène roule son tonneau en philosophe cynique, emploie 64 verbes, on distinguera soigneusement les différents milieux (d'artisans, de soldats, de scientifiques) qui contribuent avec leurs termes particuliers à enrichir ce vocabulaire-monstre. Ce qui apparaît au lecteur non prévenu un carnaval lexicologique, devient, par l'intervention de la science, de l'ordre et de la méthode—Rabelais ne sera plus le boute-en-train de momeries à la Rubens, ce sera un *poeta philologus* ou superphilologue qui a mêlé, confondu, brouillé plusieurs dictionnaires pour que nous autres, *philologunculi* modernes, les démêlions et débrouillions et pour que nous dressions un *Thesaurus linguae rabelaisiae* à l'instar de la célèbre œuvre collective munichoise. Le chapitre sur le juge Bridoye n'est pas, nous dit Abel Lefranc, une "étrange histoire des perplexités du jugement humain," "le procès de Bridoye ne semble pas [à remarquer cette assurance dubitative!] une pure fiction; le fond de l'histoire doit être réel. Il n'est nullement absurde d'imaginer qu'on trouvera quelque jour dans les archives ..."—le Bridoye prototype, le *Ur-Bridoye*, comme on a reconstruit le *Ur-Roland*! Cette attitude scientifique semble considérer le génie de Rabelais comme donné une fois pour toutes, la science n'a qu'à élucider la

combinaison fortuite d'éléments banals qui a pu déclencher le jeu de cette imagination exubérante.

De cette façon, la théorie du réalisme de Rabelais s'ancra dans les mémoires, et Lanson de nous dire dans son *Histoire de la littérature française*, toujours en forme tripartite comme Flaubert, mais sans sa vision de la beauté *extra* de Rabelais: "Jamais réalisme plus pur, plus puissant, plus triomphant ne s'est vu." Jamais au contraire mécompréhension plus effarante d'un génie ne s'est vue! Rabelais a mélangé dans son alambic artistique bien des réalités, donc il est— nous dit-on—réaliste. Le savant confond avec sa propre méthode d'observation scientifique l'essence de l'*art* rabelaisien. Dans le vacuum artistique se faufile un naturalisme censé être l'âme de Rabelais alors que ce n'est que l'âme de certains rabelaisants. Rabelais pourrait dire à ces commentateurs le mot que le génie de la terre dit à Faust: "Du gleichst dem Geist, den du begreifst, nicht mir."

Le professeur de Bonn, Schneegans, avait dès 1894 indiqué que l'essence de la poésie rabelaisienne est le *grotesque*, le comique de l'énorme ou du colossal, qui dépasse toute satire réaliste, s'attaquant à des choses précises. Par exemple, si Rabelais nous dit que l'ombre d'un clocher est féconde, la première réaction du lecteur est, selon Schneegans: "C'est une énormité, c'est impossible," ensuite il se rappellerait le but satirique, l'invective contre les abus de la vie monastique de ce temps. Je ne crois pas à ces deux étapes dans la perception du lecteur—mais ce que Schneegans a bien mis en lumière, c'est le fait que Rabelais, quand il veut *décrire du réel, crée de l'irréel*. Mais ceci est de l'antiréalisme, de l'irréalisme ou de l'hyperréalisme—à coup sûr point de *réalisme pur*!

Nous connaissons tous la tentation guettant tout rapport d'un fait précis, qui consiste à grossir les faits à relater, à renchérir sur les dimensions des choses évoquées. Ce sont pour ainsi dire les faits et les choses qui s'émancipent de leurs modèles extérieurs pour devenir des absolus fictifs, l'activité créatrice les déforme et détruit en exagérant, tout en voulant les *rendre* fidèlement. Rabelais est le type du conteur qui ne peut pas *rendre*, qui doit surfaire, outrer, fabuler: il ne peut pas dire tout simplement que dans les couvents de son temps naissent très souvent des enfants, pour lui l'ombre même du clocher est féconde: sa verve est démoniaque—si le démoniaque est le trop-

plein de force qui se dépense contre soi-même et se détruit par l'excès. La vitalité excessive étant voisine de la torpeur des choses mortes, l'hilarité devient rictus. Voilà pourquoi le comique de Rabelais rase l'horreur: nous savons bien qu'une ombre de clocher féconde est une impossibilité, mais, par le fait de l'énonciation d'une telle phrase, la possibilité en est pourtant évoquée, et notre bouche tantôt encore riante s'ourle de ce noir d'ombre qu'a senti Victor Hugo. Le lecteur de Rabelais se meut sur cette étroite bande qui sépare l'irréel et le réel, l'horreur et l'hilarité. Point n'est besoin de nier la réalité dans Rabelais, au contraire, le comique réaliste rend ces échappées de l'imagination plus terrifiantes, parce qu'il nous dissimule le vide dans lequel nous nous découvrons tout à coup. Le comique grotesque est précisément cette horreur qui se dégage du vide qui a été, il y a un instant encore, du solide.

Quand, inspiré par le livre de Schneegans, je préparais ma thèse de doctorat de 1910, je me sentais particulièrement attiré par les néologismes de Rabelais, qui se meuvent précisément sur la ligne de démarcation entre le comique et l'horrible. Tout néologisme participe évidemment des deux domaines: d'un côté, il prend racine dans le patrimoine acquis de la langue dont il doit suivre les schémas, d'autre part il s'élance dans le terrain vague de l'inexistant: comme dans tout langage constitué les mots et les choses ont conclu une alliance durable, tout mot prononcé évoque une réalité, évoque au moins le fait de l'existence, en regard du mot, d'une réalité. Mais si un mot *nouveau* est formé, celui qui l'entend pour la première fois se sent un peu ébranlé dans sa croyance à la chose derrière le mot, il a le sentiment en même temps qu'elle existe et qu'elle n'existe pas. Tout néologisme doit passer ce temps d'attente en stagiaire, sans place bien fixée dans le système de la langue. Les contemporains de Rabelais qui entendaient pour la première fois le mot *pantagruélisme*, croyaient bien avoir à faire à une philosophie, puisque l'*isme* l'indiquait, mais le radical de ce mot, un nom fantaisiste, devait produire en eux un sentiment de "dépaysement." Dans ce cas, la jovialité de cette philosophie, personifiée dans le bon géant, neutralise encore le sentiment de l'horreur du néant que provoque tout néologisme. Mais si Rabelais appelle les Sorboniens *sophistes*, *sorbillans sorbonagres*, *sorbonigènes*, *sorbonicoles*, *sorboniformes*, *sorbonisèques*, *sorbonisans*, *saniborsans*, *niborcisans*,

nous sommes véritablement poussés dans un chaos hors de toute réalité. Chacune de ces formations peut évidemment être analysée et reconduite à des réalités, matérielles ou linguistiques: la Sorbonne et le Sorbonien sont des réalités, trop réelles même pour le sentiment de Rabelais; les formations en *-gène*, *-forme*, *-cole*, *-sèque* se moulent sur des mots connus—et même les métathèses de *sorbonisant* laissent encore reconnaître un procédé de formation tant soit peu rationnel. Le procédé de style de la liste de synonymes a des racines humanistes: mais que deviennent dans Rabelais ces énumérations calmes que les inlassables humanistes alignaient pour exercer leur *copia verborum* antiquisante? Ce n'est plus un être réel qui est dénommé, et pour ainsi dire cerné, par des vocables différents, c'est une engeance pullulante d'hydres, de monstres, de fantômes, d'horreurs, émergeant du chaos et y replongeant, que Rabelais crée—ce sont des *nonce-words* qui n'existent qu'aussi longtemps que Rabelais leur insuffle son haleine vengeresse et sa haine créatrice, nous laissant en même temps pantelants d'angoisse et secoués d'un gros rire. Le comique est selon Bergson du mécanisme plaqué sur du vivant: ces bêtes de monstres multiformes qui s'entrechoquent, apparaissent avec un crépitement mécanique qui nous fait rire—mais notre rire se glace de peur devant cette vie, macabre à force de vie, simulant une réalité pour la détruire. Jamais plus en France, la majesté du mot, du mot-patrimoine n'a été aussi peu respectée que chez Rabelais: le poète roman cherche en général des 'alliances de mots' ou des 'similitudes amies' entre des mots existants plutôt que de les déchiqueter et de les réagréger. Rabelais, déchirant les coutures des paroles, a rompu le charme émanant du mot-réalité: voilà qu'il chancelle abandonné à lui-même dans l'espace vide de l'irréel. L'hypervitalité rabelaisienne engendre des monstres verbaux éphémères qui s'entredétruisent comme les dragons issus de la graine de dents de Kadmos. La fécondité "vivipare" de cette imagination s'annule dans le néant.

Dans la famille des mots *sorbonigènes* un mot existant, *sorbonien*, a été entouré de nouvelles formations fantaisistes. Mais Rabelais sait constituer des familles de mots nouvelles, comme une famille humaine s'enrichit par ses branches latérales; ce sera un empiètement encore plus violent sur l'ordre donné de la langue, une création d'un monde verbal autonome avec son ambiguïté rabelaisienne de: réalité

plus irréalité. Par exemple, l'inscription sur l'abbaye de Thélème, excluant dans sa première strophe les hypocrites:

Cy n'entrez pas, hypocrites, bigotz,
Vieux matagotz, marmiteux, borsoufflés,
Torcoulx, badaux, plus que n'estoient les Gotz,
Ny Ostrogotz, precurseurs des magotz,
Haires, cagotz, cafars empantoufflez,
Gueux mitoufflés, frapars escorniflez,
Befflez, enflez, fagoteurs de tabus;
Tirez ailleurs pour vendre vos abus.

Rabelais a emprunté à la langue française des mots signifiant l'hypocrisie, mais il leur a ajouté, guidé par certaines analogies de sons, des mots qui avant lui vivaient à l'écart des péjoratifs et dont une syllabe devient par sa volonté le symbole du vice en question: dans *bigot* la seconde syllabe, galvanisée par la haine, se met à vivre et à engendrer, ou plutôt à s'assimiler en boule de neige, d'autres mots en *-got*: la syllabe *-got*, aboiement haineux, devient un suffixe indiquant l'hypocrisie. Les singes matagots, les lépreux (*cagots*), les Goths et Ostrogoths, les géants de la bible Gog et Magog doivent faire bon ménage sur l'ordre de ce dictateur du verbe. Tout ce qui est contre nature, ampoulé ou boursoufflé, prend l'uniforme du nexus *fl-* qui symbolisera désormais ce qui s'enveloppe et se referme sur soi—tant pis si le sens originaire est violenté comme dans *befflés*—la tourbe des *emmitoufflés* doit marcher sous le fouet de l'assonance. C'est trop peu d'expliquer les différents mots particuliers (par exemple, *beffler* = it: 'beffare,' avec insertion de *l*), si l'on ne comprend pas l'ensemble de cette chevauchée de démons verbaux. La recherche des sources obstrue la source élémentaire: la haine créatrice du poète.

Mais je me suis trop attardé dans mon *hortus deliciarum*, la langue et le style, je dois montrer maintenant comment Rabelais se meut aussi dans son affabulation et dans ses idées didactiques sur les confins du réel et de l'irréel, prend son élan sur un tremplin réel pour sauter follement dans le vide de l'irréel.

Pour ce qui est de l'invention: on comprend maintenant pourquoi il nous raconte des histoires de géants légendaires et les acclimate dans le terroir tourangeau: ils doivent être chez eux dans un *home* français, mais en même temps dans un monde fantasque du *nowhere*, et Rabelais sait ébranler la fixité de notre conception du monde par le mirage du monde réel réfléchi par le monde fantasque et vice-versa. Le roi

géant Pantagruel protège de sa langue à demi tirée, comme une poule ses poussins, toute une armée contre la pluie. Le conteur, ("moi qui vous raconte ces histoires si véritables"), se promène sur cette langue et doit faire deux milles pour arriver à la gueule; là il voit de grands rochers, les dents; des prairies, des bois, des villes aussi grandes que Lyon et Poitiers—et voilà qu'il rencontre un bonhomme qui plante des choux, pour les vendre aux marchés de la ville là-dérrière. "Jésus," se dit Rabelais, "c'est ici un monde nouveau." "Non," répond le paysan, "il n'est pas nouveau; il y a bien un autre monde, où il y a le soleil, la lune et beaucoup de belles choses, mais ce monde-ci est plus ancien." Dans deux villes du voisinage, Laryngues et Pharyngues, règne la peste, dont sont morts 260,016 hommes en 8 jours—une peste née de l'haleine fétide de Pantagruel, causée elle-même par l'ail qu'il a trop goûté. C'est la polarité du réel et de l'irréel qui intéresse ici l'artiste. Dans le pharynx du géant nous trouvons un nouveau monde, moulé sur le monde ancien, mais présenté comme ancien et dont le nôtre ne serait qu'une copie: il y a là des paysans français, des mets français, des chiffres de statistiques françaises. Mais, à force de décrire le monde irréel avec réalisme, le monde réel que nous connaissons emprunte un air d'irréalité au monde phantastique—notre conception tranquille d'un monde *unique* bien constitué est remplacé par un relativisme angoissant, préludant au *Micromégas* de Voltaire; nous sommes pris d'un vertige cosmique et notre vieille terre, élargie par les découvertes alors récentes, semble se désagréger.

Il n'y a pas que de la joie et du bien-être dans la caricature rabelaisienne. Rabelais sait critiquer et désenchanter la réalité. Le discours de l'écolier limousin Janotus de Bragmardo, qui doit réclamer au nom de la Sorbonne les cloches de Notre Dame volées par Gargantua, n'est pas seulement un spécimen drôlâtre de la verbocination latiale des Sorbonnards, mais une critique du langage humain: ce discours est démasqué dans sa nullité par le fait qu'il n'a aucun but, puisque les cloches ont été déjà rendues préalablement—et le discours même n'est que *flatus vocis* et cliquetis de mots: *Omnis clocha clochabilis in clocherio clochando clochans clochativo clochare facit clochabiliter clochantes*—ce latin macarronique et scolastique est une caricature volontaire et parodique de tout langage humain, matière sonnante, sonorité fugitive. Ce Janotus de Bragmardo n'a plus d'attaches avec la réalité. Nous nous demanderons: Rabelais n'a-t-il pas de person-

nage donquichottique, vivant en pure imagination? Immédiatement, les figures de Picrochole et de ses conseillers surgissent. Picrochole s'isole du monde réel par un abus d'imagination *géographique*. L'école d'Abel Lefranc nous montre combien cette guerre picrocholine repose sur les données géographiques de la petite patrie de Rabelais—d'autant plus merveilleux est l'essaim de projets chimériques, sortant de ces cerveaux détraqués et s'éparpillant à travers le monde entier: le roi veut fonder un empire égal à celui d'Alexandre: une armée poussera jusqu'à Constantinople, une autre jusqu'à l'Euphrate: ces rêves sont basés sur une géographie scrupuleusement exacte: là le détroit de Gibraltar avec ses colonnes d'Hercule, ici Rome avec son pape et la mule; le côté matériel de l'entreprise a été envisagé: "comme les conquérants ont soif, *il fut apporté du vin*"—ce superbe passé anticipant l'avenir nous fait soudain bondir dans l'irréel. Et cette énumération—une page entière—de noms précis de terres lointaines qui réjouit le professeur d'histoire ancienne: "l'Asie Minor, Carie, Lycie, Pamphile, Celice, Lydie, Phrygie, Mysie, Bitune, Charazie ... jusques a Euphrate," nous apporte, avec l'ivresse dionysiaque de la Renaissance sentant les bornes du monde médiéval reculer et s'extasiant aux sons exotiques du luxurieux Orient, le désenchantement guettant l'esprit d'aventure, la critique du *conquistador* et de tout projet humain—Rabelais aime la conquête de nouvelles réalités, mais il en peint aussi l'irréalité: Picrochole le colérique n'ira pas en Asie minor, Carie, Lycie ..., et restera près de son clocher tourangeau.

Nous arrivons aux intentions didactiques de Rabelais, à ces idées sur l'éducation, l'ordre de la vie et de l'état, la religion. On trouve dans tout manuel (comme pour Molière et La Fontaine, les pauvres!) des chapitres sur la pédagogie, la philosophie, la religion de Rabelais, où de magnifiques temples sereins de la pensée rabelaisienne sont érigés. Les pierres de cette construction de seconde main ont été enlevées aux multiples pavillons et édifices qu'a imaginé le caprice du conteur. Sans vouloir nier ni atténuer ces pensées, je serais tenté de les replacer dans les situations épiques qui les ont fait naître: on verrait alors plus clairement le paradoxal, l'utopique et l'irréel des enseignements et des phobies de Rabelais. Celui qui a créé l'allegorie de l'Antiphysie, dont les enfants marchent sur leurs têtes avec les jambes contre-mont, imitant le créateur de l'univers qui aurait montré par les arbres que les cheveux (les racines) doivent être en bas,

les rameaux (les jambes) en haut—ce Rabelais n'a pas seulement raillé le moyen-âge ennemi de la nature, mais a *aimé* en artiste cet être contre-nature et tout irréel, comme Dante a aimé son Inferno, Cervantès son Don Quichotte—la satire est une forme ambiguë: elle doit aimer comme sujet de reproduction artistique ce que moralement elle réprouve. "L'artiste quelquefois semble chérir ses bêtes noires," dit Valéry.

Chaque fois que Rabelais nous donne son idéal d'éducation, il l'exagère jusqu'à le rendre utopique. On a souvent opposé à la pédagogie de Montaigne développant l'entendement et l'âme de ses élèves, l'éducation moyen-âgeuse, scolastiquement basée sur la mémoire de l'ex-moine Rabelais—et on se range avec l'enthousiasme dû au progrès du côté du philosophe du "que sais-je?" L'écolier chez Rabelais ne perd pas une minute du jour: il se lève à quatre heures du matin, pendant les ablutions on lui lit une page de la bible; pendant qu'il satisfait d'autres besoins, un précepteur répète le texte; pendant qu'il s'habille, se peigne et se parfume, on lui récite la leçon de la veille—mais faut-il rappeler l'autoparodie toujours présente dans Rabelais, peut-on oublier que la soif d'apprendre gigantesque de Rabelais a choisi comme héros des géants ingurgitant dans des propositions monstrueuses la science, comme ils ingurgitent le lait des mamelles de Badebec et le jus de la vigne?

Dans l'hymne de Panurge sur les crédateurs et débiteurs on se plaît à relever la vision de l'état d'endettement du monde entier, de l'harmonie de l'univers, de l'interdépendance de tout—mais n'oublions pas la façon dont ce paradoxal renversement des valeurs bourgeoises est introduit: Panurge, sorte d'Eulenspiegel français, le moins métaphysique des personnages rabelaisiens, a des dettes qu'il paiera *ad calendas graecas*. Car faire des dettes est être créateur: est créateur qui fait *de nihilo* quelque chose. D'une façon générale, les dettes sont le principe sur lequel l'univers est fondé—que seraient les astres s'ils n'empruntaient pas leur splendeur à d'autres astres, les éléments s'ils ne devaient et n'empruntaient (si l'eau ne se changeait en air ni l'air en feu), si les hommes ne s'entraidaient et si le microcosme *homme* ne se réglait pas sur la loi de l'emprunt et de la dette—Nature n'a créé l'homme que pour prêter et emprunter. Et Rabelais sent le chaos dans lequel cette vision du cosmos le précipite: "Vertus guoy, je me naye, je me pers, je m'esguare, quand j'entre on profond abisme de ce monde

ainsi prestant, ainsi doibvant. Croyez que chose divine est prester, debvoir est vertu heroïque." Cet héroïsme de l'emprunt est professé par le clown Panurge, qui, d'avocat de sa propre vie désordonnée, se transforme en avocat de l'ordre cosmique, en prêcheur d'une religion panthéiste, de l'harmonie préétablie du monde, de la sympathie entre les éléments, de la bonne volonté parmi les hommes. Comment Rabelais peut-il mettre son hymne et ses dithyrambes, sa croyance et son évangile altruiste dans la bouche d'un filou égoïste et blagueur? C'est que Rabelais a oublié son personnage—la blague, réaction très française contre trop de sécurité, sorte de renversement des valeurs temporaires parce qu'on sait qu'on reviendra bientôt aux sains préceptes de la raison—la blague, exagération de la réalité aboutissant à l'irréalité—est le pont tremblant, suspendu, pour un moment fugitif, entre les deux bords de la sécurité au-dessus de l'abîme profond de l'irréel. Panurge est bien campé sur ses deux jambes, il peut s'offrir le luxe du paradoxe et de l'utopie. Mais Rabelais se laisse entraîner par la faconde de ce personnage, il vit en lui et, tremblant de vie, il ne peut plus en distinguer les contours—tantôt Panurge était encore le blagueur, sifflant sa rengaine, tout d'un coup il est devenu le Pan-ourgos, le démiurge d'un monde poétique, irréel et réel en même temps comme toute poésie, et chantant avec une grande voix calme l'innombrable chanson de la Vie.

Quant à l'oracle sibyllin que la prêtresse de la dive bouteille révèle aux voyageurs arrivés à leur but: *Trink*, sorte de *Urwort* goethéen ou orphique, n'est-ce pas une profession de foi *ambiguë* en la vitalité dionysiaque?—s'agit-il de boire aux sources de la connaissance ou à l'outre de vin? Cet oracle jette en arrière de l'obscurité sur tout le périple de nouveaux argonautes ne rapportant aucune toison d'or: c'était donc un voyage gratuit, un voyage au bout de la nuit de l'utopie et du non-sens. Est-ce bien un réaliste, ce Rabelais qui laisse une épopée massive de la connaissance s'effiler en une pointe ténue s'effaçant dans l'invisible et se résumant en un *Ignorabimus*?

Rabelais est orphique, grotesque, gigantesque. Il est l'incarnation du démon de la vitalité qui, nouveau Saturne, dévore sa propre progéniture. La vie dionysiaque contient en elle comme principe dialectique la destruction de cette vie, son effritement en une poussière de vie. Le grand épique de la Renaissance française n'a pas créé de la beauté plastique, reposant en elle-même, et de l'harmonie réconciliant

les contrastes comme l'Italien Arioste; il n'a pas doré d'un éclat imaginaire de soleil ancien une âpre réalité vécue comme le Portugais Camoëns. Il fait écumer la vie drue, insolente, tapageuse, mais les perles de cette écume retombent sur terre, miroitantes d'une splendeur ambiguë—Rabelais ne voit pas encore à la manière *baroque* la rupture du monde en deux principes antithétiques et irréconciliables, vie et songe, spectacle et réalité, qui s'intègrent tant bien que mal dans l'humour de Cervantès ou qui s'affrontent avec un dualisme effrayant dans Calderon: "*que toda la vida representaciones es,*" ou dans Shakespeare:

Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

Rabelais mourant ne peut pas avoir prononcé le mot—style baroque—que lui prête l'anecdote: "Tirez le rideau, la farce est jouée." Pour lui la vie n'est ni farce ni scène dont on s'en va désillusionné, mais un magnifique élément qui l'entoure, l'exalte—et lui brouille la vue, dans lequel "il se nage, il se perd, il s'égare." La sainte ivresse d'une *vie pour la vie*, qui avait déjà leurré l'Archiprêtre de Hita, Boccace et Chaucer, et qui s'épanouit en Rabelais, Arioste et Camoëns, est un rêve que l'humanité n'a jamais pu revivre.

ANNEXE I

Ad "*philologunculi*" p. 140: Je n'ai qu'à prendre la dernière publication rabelaisante, l'article de M. Coindreau dans *Romanic review* (1938), p. 120, pour trouver, battant son plein, cette rage de *debunking* vis-à-vis de l'imagination de notre auteur: "... l'originalité du Maître est moins grande qu'on ne l'avait cru jusqu'alors. ... Grâce à la phalange d'érudits que M. Abel Lefranc a su grouper autour de lui, la réalité se fait jour derrière les fictions les plus brillantes. L'Abbaye de Thélème, elle-même, se voit contrainte de descendre sur terre. On aurait pu penser que ce "rêve d'un moine ..." "... n'était qu'une improvisation surgie par génération spontanée. ... Il n'en est rien. Le pays de Thélème est en Chinonais. ... L'opinion sur ce point est unanime." M. Coindreau, pris dans l'élan de cet esprit lefranquiste, découvre ainsi une chanson populaire du Bas-Poitou "que Rabelais a pu connaître," dans laquelle "gaillardement" "tout' les bell' fill' " "et les garçons de dix-huit ans" sont mis—elle serait le modèle de deux règles des Thélémistes: "Item, parce qu'en celluy temps on ne mettoit en religion des femmes sinon celles qui estoient borgnes, boyteuses, bossues, laydes ... ny les hommes, sinon catarrés, mal néz niays ... feut ordonné que là ne seroient repceues sinon les belles, bien formées

et bien naturées, et les beaux, bien formés et bien naturés ... Au regard de l'âge légitime, les femmes y estoient repçues depuis dix jusques à quinze ans, les hommes depuis douze jusques à dix et huit." Mais chez Rabelais les couples qui se marient sortent au contraire de l'Abbaye! Qui ne voit que Rabelais prend exactement le contre-pied des règles des vrais couvents et excelle dans la description *détaillée* de l'ordre impérieusement paradoxal et paradoxalement impérieux de ce couvent genre renaissance, alors que le couvent "de coéducation" de la chanson populaire est tout simplement une variante ou une amplification du motif des amants fidèles devenant moine et nonnain (comme dans les chansons à transformations, le *contrasto* de Ciullo dal Camo, etc.). Cette "source" que Rabelais "pouvait connaître" ne nous apprend rien sur l'imagination de Rabelais (qui ne sait pas seulement "tirer parti de ce que le monde extérieur lui offrait," comme dit M. Coindreau, mais le travestit, le transforme).

ANNEXE II

Un véritable héritier français de Rabelais (mais sans son souffle cosmique) parmi nos contemporains, c'est Ferdinand Céline: on n'a qu'à ouvrir un de ses copieux volumes à une page quelconque pour trouver des passages rabelaisiens, c'est à dire construisant des architectures de phantôme sur des données simili-réelles: A. Gide parle dans *NRF*, XXVI, 632 ff., de "l'excès gratuit de sa colère lyrique": "Ce n'est pas la réalité que peint Céline; c'est l'hallucination que la réalité provoque; et c'est par là qu'il intéresse." Comme pour Rabelais, les critiques éberlués sont allés chercher les "éléments réalistes" dans cette "chevauchée de Don Quichotte en plein ciel" qu'est "Bagatelles pour un massacre." Voici un échantillon de cette prose rabelaisienne *après-la-lettre*, à invectives irréelles, rappelant l'inscription apocalyptique de Thélème, *loc. cit.*, p. 76):

Penser "sozial!" cela veut dire dans la pratique, en termes bien crus: "penser juif! pour les Juifs! par les Juifs, sous les Juifs!" Rien d'autre! Tout le surplus immense des mots, le vrombissant verbiage socialitico-humanitario-scientifique, tout le cosmique carafouillage de l'impératif despotique juif n'est que l'enrobage mirageux, le charabia fatras poussif, la sauce orientale pour ces encoulés d'Aryens, la fricassée terminologique pourrie pour l'adulation des "aveulés blancs," ivrognes rampants, intouchables, qui s'en foutrent à bite que veux-tu, s'en mystifient, s'en bafrent à crever.

ANNEXE III

La "formule de Rabelais" que j'ai tenté d'établir a été appliquée par Zola à sa propre activité (lettre du 22 mars 1885 à Henri Céard, citée par F. Rauhut, *Germ.-rom. Monatsschr.*, XXVI [1938], 451): "Vous n'êtes pas stupéfait, comme les autres, de trouver en moi un poète. ... J'agrandis, cela est certain. ... J'ai l'hypertrophie du détail, le saut dans les étoiles sur le tremplin de l'observation exacte. ..."

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

ELIZABETHAN MORALITY AND THE FOLIO REVISIONS OF SIDNEY'S *ARCADIA*

KENNETH THORPE ROWE

WHEN Sir Philip Sidney, in his *Defense of poesie*, evaluated literature for its power of delightful teaching by means of notable examples of virtues and vices, he was stating not only his personal view but a commonplace of Renaissance critical theory. Because of the character and reputation of the author, special ethical value was attached by contemporaries to Sidney's own *Arcadia*.¹ The *Arcadia* is, in fact, one of those occasional single works in the history of literature which is a grand repository of thought and manners from the age in which it was produced. As is to be expected in a late chivalric romance, love shares attention equally with arms as a field of conduct. The *Arcadia*, then, is one of the most important documents for a study of sex-conventions and ethics in upper-class Elizabethan society.

Interpretation, however, is subject to a peculiar difficulty because of revisions from the manuscript of the *Old Arcadia* to the first printed version. To resolve the difficulty is the purpose of this paper.² The revisions affect two of the most significant episodes, that of Pyrocles' visit to Philoclea's chamber and the consummation of their love, at the end of Book III of the *Old Arcadia*,³ and Musidorus' contemplated attempt on Pamela's virginity, also in Book III of the *Old Arcadia*.

¹ Gabriel Harvey in *Pierce's supererogation*, for example (*Elizabethan critical essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, II, 263-64).

² This paper represents a necessary piece of ground-clearing in the preparation of a book on love and marriage in upper-class Elizabethan society.

³ I use the convenient terminology introduced by Samuel Lee Wolff in *The Greek romances in Elizabethan prose fiction* (1912), and followed by other writers since: *Old Arcadia* for the original version; *New Arcadia* for the unfinished revision of the 1590 quarto; *Arcadia* for the version of the 1593 folio, which consists of the *New Arcadia* and the last three books, slightly revised, of the *Old Arcadia*. *Arcadia* is also used in a general sense for reference to the totality of the romance in all versions. Page references below are to the Cambridge edition of Sidney's *Works*, edited by Albert Feuillerat, in which Vol. I is the *New Arcadia*, reprinted from the 1590 quarto edited by Fulke Greville; Vol. II, the last three books of the original version as edited in the 1593 folio by the Countess of Pembroke; and Vol. IV, the *Old Arcadia*, edited from the Clifford manuscript, one of six copies of Sidney's original manuscript which have been discovered.

The episode of Musidorus is deleted entirely from the first printed version, and the other changed completely in its ethical bearing: the consummation of love is omitted and Pyrocles' purpose is to persuade Philoclea to elope with him. Furthermore, the authorship of these two revisions, which are with one exception, and that not a matter of ethics, the most radical made in the folio, is open to question. They have been repeatedly ascribed to the editing of Sidney's sister Mary, Countess of Pembroke, with the motive a desire to purify the sex-conduct represented in her brother's manuscript.⁴

Detailed study of Lady Mary's editorship, and of the entire body of revisions, both in the *New Arcadia* and in the last three books of the *Old Arcadia* as edited by Lady Mary in the 1593 folio, has produced a variety of evidence that all the folio revisions were of Sidney's author-

⁴ Notably by Bertram Dobell, "New light upon Sir Philip Sidney's 'Arcadia,'" *Quarterly review*, CLIX (1909), 78; Mario Praz, "Sidney's original *Arcadia*," *London mercury*, XV (1927), 513-14; R. W. Zandvoort, *Sidney's 'Arcadia,' a comparison between the two versions* (Amsterdam, 1929), pp. 28 ff. Others who have accused Lady Mary of meddling, but without using such terms as "suppression" and "bowdlerizing," are Samuel Lee Wolff, *The Greek romances in Elizabethan prose fiction* (New York, 1912), pp. 346-47; Edwin Greenlaw, "Sidney's *Arcadia* as an example of Elizabethan allegory," *Kittredge anniversary papers* (Boston, 1913), p. 335, n. 3; and Albert Feuillerat, *Sidney's Works*, I, vii.

At the time of my first consideration of the subject no one, so far as I could discover, had suggested that Philip Sidney may have made the revisions himself, or at least have indicated them. Miss Mona Wilson and Dr. Kenneth O. Myrick have since stated such a view, but in a manner not helpful to interpretation of the ethical significance of the *Arcadia*. Miss Wilson gives no evidence, and Dr. Myrick attributes to Sir Philip the motivation formerly ascribed to his sister.

Miss Wilson states: "There can be little doubt that the alteration, though made by the Countess of Pembroke, follows Sidney's directions" (*Sir Philip Sidney* [London, 1931], p. 154). There is no indication of the reasons for the conclusions; so far as the reader is enlightened, it may have been an intuition. Dr. Myrick, in *Sir Philip Sidney as a literary craftsman* (Cambridge, Mass., 1935), agrees with Miss Wilson and gives several pages (286-89) of evidence. He concludes: "Sidney's motive for the change, I believe, is supplied by Greville. He directed that the *Arcadia* be burned, says this biographer, because on his deathbed he 'discovered, not only the imperfection, but vanitie of these shadowes, how daintily soever limned: as seeing that even beauty it selfe, in all earthly complexions, was more apt to allure men to evill, than to fashion any goodness in them.' To no other part of the *Arcadia* are these remarks so applicable as to the scenes expurgated by the Countess of Pembroke" (p. 289; Dr. Myrick quotes from Greville's *Life of Sidney*).

Sidney's deathbed request that the *Arcadia* be burned was the result of an overwrought state produced by the characteristic religious exercises of the period, in which he looked upon all the works of this life as vain (Malcolm W. Wallace, *Life of Sidney* [Cambridge, 1915], pp. 385-86). It is clear from Greville's statement that Sidney was thinking of no particular aspects of the *Arcadia*, but of all earthly things. A question may be raised as to the consistency of Dr. Myrick's reference to the "scenes expurgated by the Countess of Pembroke"; if Sidney had already indicated the expurgation of the scenes, they would no longer have existed in his mind as part of the *Arcadia*. The *Arcadia* he most naturally would have referred to was the *New Arcadia*, the unfinished revision, intrusted to Greville's care (letter from Greville to Sir Francis Walsingham, November, 1586, quoted by Wallace, *Life of Sidney*, p. 232).

ship or clear indication. Independently of textual evidence, consideration of the ethical background of the *Arcadia*, both in literature and in Elizabethan society, invalidates, I believe, the view that either Lady Mary or Sir Philip would have made the revisions to purify the sex-conduct of the *Arcadia*. It is my purpose here to present, first, the ethical background on the basis of which I reject the theory of revision by Lady Mary, and, second, evidence of a motivation for revision by Sidney.⁵

For clarity of reference it is necessary to summarize the two episodes as first written and as revised.

The situation leading to the entrance of Pyrocles into Philoclea's chamber is the same in both versions. Pyrocles and Musidorus, princes of Macedon and Thessalia, in disguise have penetrated the isolation in which Basilius, king of Arcadia, has placed his daughters, Philoclea and Pamela, to keep them from marriage, and have won their loves. Musidorus has arranged for Pamela to elope with him to Thessalia. On the day of their flight Pyrocles by tricking Basilius and Gynecia, his queen, into absence from the royal lodge for a night makes an opportunity to see Philoclea alone.

From this point the story differs radically in the two versions. In the manuscript, Pyrocles' purpose is the immediate consummation of his love; in the folio, it is the same as that of Musidorus, to accomplish an elopement. In the manuscript Pyrocles, having barred all the doors but one of which he had no knowledge, enters the chamber of Philoclea, and after some complications due to Philoclea's misunderstanding of a recent pretended indifference, easily wins her to the mutual contentment of their love which he desires. No other end is suggested but the achievement of the happiness of a single night, which, however, they look upon as the accomplishment of their marriage. Pyrocles puts aside thoughts of how he shall meet the difficulties he has created for the following day. They fall asleep. In the meantime, Dametas, the guardian of Pamela, returns to his house, finds Pamela gone, comes to the royal lodge, gains entrance through the door overlooked by Pyrocles, and discovers the lovers.

In the folio any idea of consummation of marriage is omitted: Pyrocles' purpose is to persuade Philoclea to go away with him to Macedon. After Pyrocles finally convinces her of the faithfulness of his love, she consents. When Philoclea attempts to prepare for departure, however, she is overcome by weakness from her recent illness and the immediate emotional strain, and falls fainting. Pyrocles places her on the bed; she recovers consciousness, but is unable to arise and falls asleep. At last Pyrocles, too, wearied with the

⁵ For the editorial and textual study, with the history of comment on the revisions, cf. "The Countess of Pembroke's editorship of the *Arcadia*," *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 122-38.

turmoil of his thoughts on the difficulties into which his rash venture has brought them, falls asleep beside Philoclea. Thus Dametas discovers them.

In the revision of the central episode, about a page of the prose text is omitted, and also a song describing Philoclea's charms which Sidney had transferred to the *New Arcadia*, ascribing it there to Pyrocles in the scene in which he watches the two princesses bathing in the River Ladon.⁶ Two and one-half pages are added.

The revision of the scene in Philoclea's chamber vitally affects the concluding situation of the story, in which Pyrocles and also Musidorus, who suffered mischance in his flight with Pamela and was brought back captive, are placed on trial for their respective crimes according to the laws of Arcadia. (They were also implicated in the supposed murder of Basilius, which does not concern us here.) The case of Musidorus is the same in both versions; he is convicted of attempting to steal the princess from her parents and her people. In the manuscript version Pyrocles, to save the life of Philoclea, confesses to having attempted the violation of Philoclea, but convinces the judge that he was frustrated by her innocence and chastity. In the folio the confession was of an attempt to carry her away, likewise defeated, according to Pyrocles' story, by Philoclea's resistance. The folio shows careful revision for consistency with the change in the central episode. At least nineteen changes were made in the part of the text following the end of Book III, and eleven in the preceding part of the text to make all that leads up to the episode consistent. All of the changes are minute, a few lines at most, often only a phrase or single word. There is only one slip: in the manuscript the princes are accused of different crimes, subject to different punishments; in the folio they are accused of the same crime, for which one punishment is announced [II, 196] but later are condemned to the different punishments of the manuscript [II, 198].

The revision of the Musidorus-Pamela episode is associated with that of the episode of Philoclea's chamber by related subject-matter and ascription to qualms of taste on the part of Lady Mary. In the course of the flight of Musidorus and Pamela, Pamela becomes weary and sleeps with her head in Musidorus' lap. In the manuscript [IV, 190] Musidorus, overcome by her beauty, is moved to an attempt upon her virginity, although Pamela had consented to go with him only on condition of an oath to keep her inviolate until they could be formally married. He is interrupted by the attack of a band of villains, outlawed for a recent uprising in Arcadia. In the folio [II, 27] Musidorus' approach to breaking his vow is deleted. In the manuscript, when the story comes back to Musidorus [IV, 286], the outlaws are designated as instruments of divine justice: they were "guyded by the everlasting Justice to bee Chastizers of *Musidorus* broken vowes." In the folio [II, 119] it is the outlaws who are the recipients of the divine justice: "they were guided by the everlasting Justice, using themselves to bee punishers of their faultes, and

⁶ I, 288 ff.

making theyr owne actions the beginning of their chastizements (unhappely both for him and themselves) to light on Musidorus." The divine justice is applicable to the outlaws because a number were slain by Musidorus, and the others later arrested.

These are the changes which have been attributed by successive scholars to Lady Mary's prudery. These scholars have apparently reasoned on the basis of an initial assumption that Lady Mary was a Victorian in her attitude toward sex. I shall endeavor to demonstrate in terms of Elizabethan background the unlikelihood of her having made the revisions for ethical reasons. First I shall consider the literature to which she was accustomed, and second the attitude and conventions of the society to which she belonged with respect to the principal situation involved, marriage by consummation preceding the marriage ceremony, and the closely associated subject of marriage for love as opposed to the arranged marriage.

Whatever may have been countenanced in actual life, marriage by consummation on the basis of private betrothal and preceding marriage by ceremony was a convention of the chivalric literature popular in the courtly society of which Mary, Countess of Pembroke, was a member, and was presented in these works as consonant with the highest virtue. The chivalric works which were sources for or influences on the *Arcadia* are especially pertinent as examples. Marriage without the ceremony occurs in each of the chivalric sources for the *Arcadia*, *Amadis de Gaule*, the non-pastoral episodes of Montemayor's *Diana*, and in two other most influential chivalric works, Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* and Malory's *Morte Darthur*.

The central story of *Amadis de Gaule* is as follows:

Amadis was born of King Perion and a princess, Elisena, after private betrothal and before their formal marriage; and to Amadis and the Princess Oriane was born in the same manner a son Esplandian, who became the hero of later books. As in the *Arcadia*, the law of the land (lesser Britain for Elisena and Great Britain for Oriane) punished by death those convicted of the act of marriage without solemnity of marriage, and the princesses were under the necessity of concealing the birth of their sons. Yet no shadow of moral disapproval is thrown upon the conduct of these heroes and heroines; they are presented as models of virtue. When the private marriage of Oriane and Amadis became known it was looked upon as a real and binding marriage, and circumstances having brought King Lisuart to approval of Amadis as a son-in-law, the formal marriage was celebrated with great rejoicing and honor.

The course of the love of the principals in the *Amadis* is paralleled in that of Agraves of Scotland and the Princess Oline of Norway, whose relations are also presented as a pattern of true love.

The author of the *Amadis* makes it perfectly clear that Amadis and Oriane did not sin, since they had passed the promise of marriage.

Oriane, in confessional, tells Nascian, a holy hermit, of her son Esplandian. Nascian first rebukes her, until she explains that she and Amadis had pledged themselves to each other as husband and wife, when he assures her that God has not been offended: "Certes mon fille, respondit l'Hermite, nostre Seigneur ne doit estre content de vous, ayont fait telle iniure à vostre propre ame, pour une volupte desordonnee, mesmes vous qui estes née de si haute parens & qui deuez estre miroir & exemple au peuple, sur lequel Dieu vous à preferee. Mon pere, respondit elle, ie scay bien qui i'ay griueusement peche, & toutes fois se que ie fis, fut de femme à mary: car sur l'heure nous nous donnasmes l'un a l'autre. Adonc luy declare comme Archelaus l'auoit emmenee, & que depuis Amadis la secourut, ainsi que cy deuant vous à esté recité. Donc l'Hermite fut tresayse conoissant que par ce moyens Dieu n'auoit esté offensé."⁷

Later, in persuading King Lisuart that it would be unlawful to give Oriane as a wife to another than Amadis, Nascian reaffirms God's approval of the marriage: "C'est que ma Dame Oriane est dé-jà coniointe par mariage à vn autre, que nostre Signeur a eu agreable, & lui a pleu qu' ainsi fut ... croyez, Sire, ... que nostre Signeur ayt donne consentement a tel mariage: car Esplandian en est yssu, duquel Urgande la Deconnuë à predit les grandes merueilles que vous scauez."⁸

The most purely chivalric episode of Montemayor's *Diana* is the beautiful and romantic love story of the Moors, Abyndaraez and Xarifa (Book IV).

Abyndaraez and Xarifa pledged themselves to marriage secretly because of the certain opposition of Xarifa's father, who would desire a wealthier husband for his daughter. Xarifa promised to send for Abyndaraez on the first occasion of her father's absence from the house, "that that might have effect, which was betrothed upon between us both."⁹ The opportunity followed shortly thereafter. On his way to Xarifa, Abyndaraez was taken prisoner by the Christian, Roderigo of Narvaez, governor of Alora. Abyndaraez related his story, and Roderigo thought so highly of the character of his young captive and of his enterprise that he granted him a parole to continue his journey. The marriage was accomplished by a simple exchange of vows and immediate consummation. Xarifa's words were that she had brought

⁷ Nicolas de Herberay, trans. (Anvers, 1573), Book III, p. 73 (chap. xiii).

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 33 (chap. xix).

⁹ Bartholomew Yong, trans. (London, 1598), p. 116.

Abyndaraez hither, "to make thee Lord of me, and of my father's treasure, under the honourable name of a lawfull husband." Abyndaraez responded: "this pledge I give thee in token of my unspeakable love, that I receive thee for my beloved Lady and wife."¹⁰ The lovers are reconciled to Xarifa's father by the intercession of the king, who commanded that her father should pardon their sudden marriage without his consent.

A similar marriage occurs in the "Second Part of the *Diana* of George of Montemayor," in the story of Disteus and Dardania (Book VIII) added by Alonso Perez.

The houses of the lovers are at enmity. Their marriage is without formal ceremony and secret. Discovered by Dardania's brother Sagastes, they escape the city and live as shepherds. Their conduct is highly approved by the many friends their virtue has won.¹¹

In *Orlando furioso* the love held up to the highest praise for its virtue and perfection, with the exception of that of the principal heroine, Bradamante, for Ruggiero, is that of Isabella and Zerbino, whose marriage was by private betrothal only.

A difference in faiths, Zerbino being a Christian and Isabella a Saracen, making marriage impossible, Isabella escaped from her father's house and accompanied Zerbino on his knight-errantry until his death, after which she was dissuaded by a hermit from taking her own life, converted to the Christian faith, and persuaded to enter a monastery. On the way to the monastery she fell into the hands of one who would have violated her chastity. To save herself from this fate she brought about her own death. Ariosto exalts her memory in several stanzas which amount to a poetic canonization as a saint.¹² Zerbino is presented throughout as a flawless character.

Ariosto does not show any consciousness of an unconventionality to be defended in Isabella; he simply praises her for the faithfulness of her love. In connection with the episode of Ginevra, daughter of the king of Scotland, falsely accused of receiving a lover and condemned to die by Scottish law, he champions the cause of general freedom in love for women. He condemns the law as

l'aspra legge di Scozia, empia e severa,¹³

and through Rinaldo ascribes the severity toward freedom in love to the ignorance of the vulgar:

quel suave fin d'amor, che pare
all'ignorante vulgo un grave eccesso.¹⁴

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

¹¹ Canto XXIX, stanzas 26-31.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 366-69.

¹³ Canto IV, stanza 59.

¹⁴ Canto IV, stanza 66.

The love-stories in Malory's *Morte Darthur* are, for the most part, from sources in the traditions of courtly love and of love paramour. The story in Book VII of Sir Gareth, a character of substantial virtue, and Dame Lionesse is an exception.

They plighted their troth and gained of Dame Lionesse's brother consent to their marriage. In the meanwhile, they planned to satisfy their love immediately (chap. xxii). The plan was discovered and thwarted by the lady's sister, Dame Linet, who thought it better for their "honour and worship" that the young people should abide the day of their marriage. Dame Lionesse insisted that her conduct was entirely right and proper, and her brother Sir Gringamore, who was in authority over her, showed no disapproval. The author's attitude is one of detachment.

That the specific sex-situation involved in the visit of Pyrocles to Philoclea's chamber was in good literary standing in the reading of an Elizabethan lady is evident from the examples cited. Sidney did not model his romance on such works without knowing the tastes of his sister and her friends, for whose entertainment it was written. The intimate manner of address in which he presented the particular scene shows that he not only expected it to be acceptable but of special interest to them.¹⁵

A parallel from Thomas Lodge's *A Margarite of America* shows the same confidence in the presentation to ladies of intimate situations of sex.

Margarite, having gone to bed, complains of her as yet unfulfilled love: "Alas, unkind love, that seasonest thy delights with delaies. Why givest thou not poore ladies as great patience to endure, as penance in their durance?" Following her complaint, Lodge writes: "In these thoughts and this speech love sealed up her eies till on the morrow; but what she dreamed I leave that to you Ladies to decide, who having dallied with love, have likewise beene acquainted with his dreames."¹⁶

¹⁵ The situation in which the *Arcadia* in its original form was composed is reflected in the *Old Arcadia* by occasional use of the first person and by parenthetic address to the ladies for whom Sidney was writing. The passage in which Pyrocles achieves the end of his desire is such an instance (IV, 226-27). After the song delineating Philoclea's charms, Sidney writes: "But doo not thincke (Fayre Ladyes) his thoughtes had such Lysure as to ronne over so longe a Ditty: The onely generall fancy of yt came into his mynde fixed upon the sence of the sweet Subject." Pyrocles' successful use of the time is described in the next seven lines, and Sidney closes the situation with: "Hee gives mee occasyon to leave him in so happy a plight, least my Penn mighte seeme to grudge, at the due Blisse of these pore Lovers, whose Loyalty had but smalle respite of theyre fyery Agonyes."

¹⁶ *Menaphon and A Margarite of America*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Oxford, 1927), pp. 169-70.

The conventionality in Elizabethan literature of the situation in the episode of Philoclea's chamber is beyond question. That the sensuous details of its treatment should have given offense to an Elizabethan taste is almost inconceivable. The frank sensuousness of such well-known poems as Lodge's *Glaucus and Scilla*, Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* is a commonplace of Elizabethan literature. The standing of such poems in the time of their authors is evidenced by the recommendation of *Glaucus and Scilla* on the title-page as "Verie fit for young Courtiers to peruse, and coy Dames to remember."¹⁷ Furthermore, the most sensuous part of the passage in the *Arcadia* is the song, which was retained in the folio in its new position in the second book.

I have found no exact parallel in the works read by Elizabethans for Musidorus' contemplated attempt on Pamela's virginity, deleted in the folio, such as was found for the Pyrocles-Philoclea episode; but the general character of Elizabethan literature is against the view that it was deleted because of any such sex-squeamishness as Dobell, Praz, and Zandvoort attribute to Lady Mary.¹⁸

The conventions of literature are not always a reflection of those of life. Since the *Arcadia* is a romance and subject only to the former conventions, the evidence from the field of literature might be considered sufficient to establish the unlikelihood of Lady Mary's having made the revisions ascribed to her on the grounds of prudery. The case is strengthened, however, by the fact that the Elizabethan acceptance of consummation of marriage on the basis of private betrothal in literature does reflect a social situation in sixteenth-century England. To gather evidence for this fact I have had to accept the undignified task of scandal-hunting among the ladies of Elizabeth's court. The search reveals two modes of conduct unconventional in a legal sense, but having little or no social stigma attached if the relationship were one of genuine love pursued with faithfulness and honor by both parties

¹⁷ Printed by Richard Jones (London, 1589).

¹⁸ The conduct of Ruggiero, the principal hero of *Orlando furioso*, toward Angelica, having rescued her naked from the rock to which she was bound as a sacrifice to a sea-monster, is similar to that of Musidorus. Ruggiero was moved purely by sensual desire toward Angelica, as he was the faithful lover of Bradamante. Angelica escaped by means of a magic ring. Ariosto is genially tolerant:

"son la qual non saria stato quel crudo
Zenocrate de lui piu continente" (Canto XI, st. 3).

concerned: the attachment of a married man or woman to a person not the legal husband or wife; and intimate association between a man and woman privately betrothed but not formally married. A social background existed which gave to these two relations a standing quite different from mere countenancing of the general licentiousness to which a society such as that of Elizabeth's court is liable. The arranged marriage was the rule; the situation had not changed materially since the period of the Paston Letters. In a society controlled by the institution of the marriage of convenience, the opportunity to marry for love was a lucky accident. The implications of this institution for adultery are obvious and familiar but do not concern us here.

The custom of marriage by consummation following upon betrothal has been less discussed. If two young people happened to fall in love, and a fair proportion of them did, they were frequently afraid to broach the subject of marriage to the young woman's father, or whoever had legal authority over her, for fear the parent or guardian already had other plans which he would not alter, even though the young man happened to be perfectly eligible. If the young man were not eligible by birth and wealth, so much the worse. If their affections were discovered, they would be kept apart; a formal marriage was quite impossible. So they plighted their troth, and with no certain goal of formal marriage before them, they naturally entered secretly into the relations of marriage at once. If the birth of a child became imminent, and the fact was discovered, they might be disinherited, but they were at least married, recognized as such, and could openly live together. For the Church, in society exactly as in the romances, held a betrothal, even though private and without witnesses, as absolutely binding. While the Church did not approve of such arrangements, it was committed to upholding them once made.¹⁹ Sometimes the man was not true to his love, and if there had been no witnesses to the betrothal, the woman might be deserted. Such conduct, though difficult to attack legally, met with social disfavor. When the lovers remained true, the discovery of betrothal, consummated as marriage or not, was followed by a formal marriage, which might or might not

¹⁹ For the position of the Church on the binding power of private betrothal, see H. S. Bennett, *The Pastons and their England* (Cambridge, 1922), pp. 42-46, on the love-affair of Margery Paston and Richard Calle.

turn out well, depending somewhat upon the degree of conciliation reached with the persons in authority.

For persons of high rank in Elizabethan England, the fear of the disapproval of the queen, either for political or personal reasons, was added to the fear of parental disapproval, was, in fact, the stronger. Under pressure of the combined fears, love-marriages were more likely than not to begin informally. The marriages of Sir Walter Raleigh with Elizabeth Throckmorton,²⁰ and of Henry, Earl of Southampton, with Elizabeth Vernon are two famous examples.²¹ No trace of moral or social reproach was connected with them. The marriage of the Earl of Leicester, the uncle of Philip Sidney and Lady Mary, to Lady Lettys Devereux, widow of Walter, Earl of Essex, was probably of the same sort,²² as was that of Lady Mary's intimate friend, Dorothy Devereux, to Sir Thomas Perrott.²³ The relationship of Mary Fitton and Lord Herbert, the eldest son of Mary, Countess of Pembroke, became a scandal because Lord Herbert, while admitting responsibility for Mary Fitton's condition, refused to marry her.²⁴

The court abounded in secret meetings, disguisings, the dangers of discovery, elopements, flights and pursuits, the *peripeteia* of the romances; and the romances, in their convention of marriage by consummation under the difficulties imposed by parental and royal authority, recorded, with some exaggeration, a condition of society.

This state of affairs did not pass without criticism from the spokesmen for authority. But the inveighing against licentiousness in the ethical writings of men of the upper class of Elizabethan society tends to be misinterpreted through lack of consideration of the firm establishment of the marriage by arrangement. In the morality of the new

²⁰ Edward Edwards, *The life and letters of Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1868), pp. 135 ff.; William Stebbing, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (Oxford, 1891), pp. 88 ff.; Milton Waldman, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1928), pp. 72 ff.; Edward Thompson, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (London, 1935), pp. 81 ff.

²¹ Letters of Rowland White to Sir Robert Sidney, *Sidney state papers*, ed. Arthur Collins (London, 1746), II, 81, 82, 87, 88, 90; letters in *Calendar of state papers, domestic series*, V (1598-1701), 85, 92, 121; *Letters written by John Chamberlain*, ed. Sarah William (Westminster, 1861), pp. 18, 27, 29.

²² William Dugdale, *The baronage of England* (London, 1676), II, 178.

²³ John Strype, *The life and acts of John Aylmer* (Oxford, 1821), pp. 217-19; Walter Devereux, *The lives and letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex* (London, 1853), I, 156; Malcolm W. Wallace, *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 258, n. 1.

²⁴ Lady Newdigate-Newdegate, *Gossip from a muniment-room, being passages in the lives of Anne and Mary Fitton* (London, 1898), pp. 42-44.

middle-class Puritanism and in the writings of a poet such as Spenser, strongly influenced by a medieval religious tradition, chastity figures as a holy virtue; but the practical moralists of the court show concern for the stability of society, which meant the conservation of wealth and the protection of titles, rather than for an idea of personal purity. The free marriages were called licentious, but licentiousness was identified with what is now called romantic love as such. The only legitimate sex-love was that which developed between husband and wife after a marriage made for practical considerations, not by direction of the emotions. Roger Ascham wrote:

And see the great obedience, that was used in old tyme to fathers and governours. No sonne, were he never so old of yeares, never so great of birth, though he were a kynges sonne, might not marry, but by his father and mothers also consent. . . . Our tyme is so farre from that old discipline and obedience, as no, not onelie yong ientlemen, but even verie girles dare without all feare, though not without open shame, where they list, and how they list, marie them selves in spite of father, mother, God, good order, and all.²⁵

The distinction between what a nineteenth- or twentieth-century and a sixteenth-century Englishman is likely to think of as licentious is especially clear in Sir Walter Raleigh's "Instructions to his son": The next and greatest care ought to be in the choice of a wife, and the only danger therein, is beauty, by which all men in all ages, wise and foolish, have been betrayed. And though I know it vain to use reasons or arguments to dissuade thee from being captivated therewith, there being few or none that ever resisted that witchery, yet I cannot omit to warn thee, as of other things, which may be thy ruin and destruction. For the present time, it is true, that every man prefers his fantasy in that appetite, before all other worldly desires, leaving the care of honour, credit, and safety, in respect thereof . . . though thou canst not forbear to love, yet forbear to link; and after a while thou shalt find an alteration in thyself, and see another far more pleasing than the first, second, or third love. . . . Thy best time for marriage will be towards thirty, for . . . the younger times are unfit, either to choose or govern a wife and family.²⁶

Lord Burleigh, in "Advice to his son," states the same basis for choosing a wife as Raleigh, and adds, "Marry thy daughters in time, lest they marry themselves."²⁷

²⁵ *The schoolmaster*, in *English works* (Cambridge, 1904), pp. 203-4.

²⁶ *Practical wisdom, letters to young men*, by Sir Walter Raleigh et al. (New York, 1902), pp. 12-17.

²⁷ *Practical wisdom*, pp. 118-22.

In Thomas Lodge's *A Margarite of America* the term "licentious" is used of Arsadachus for having married for love instead of by the arrangement of his father, the Emperor.²⁸ The conflict going on in the period is reflected in the numerous debates in Lyly's *Euphues* on the subject of marriage for love or by parental choice.

It has been demonstrated that the episode of Pyrocles' visit to Philoclea's chamber as it appears in the *Old Arcadia* was entirely conventional in Elizabethan literature and reading, and was not likely to have given offense to Lady Mary's sense of good taste. It has also been shown that in the actual life of the society to which Lady Mary belonged, conduct parallel to that of Pyrocles and Philoclea in the romance was sufficiently prevalent and regarded with enough tolerance to make it unlikely that Lady Mary would have objected to the episode on grounds of sex-morality. Even had she felt such a criticism it is improbable that she would have been prompted by it to the particular revision made, since the moral aspect of the episode has two elements: the consummation of marriage without the ceremony and marriage for love instead of by the arrangement of parents. Those members of the Elizabethan court society who condemned such marriages based their objection on the latter element in the situation, the rebellion against authority. From their point of view the sex-morality of the *Arcadia* was not basically improved by the change made in the episode.

There remains the question of Lady Mary's personal relation to the attitudes which have been termed characteristic. The confidence with which Sidney addressed the episode in its original form to his sister, with whose attitudes he must have been familiar, would seem to be sufficient evidence of the acceptability of the episode to Lady Mary at the time of writing. R. W. Zandvoort suggests,²⁹ however, that with the lapse of at least a dozen years before the publication of the folio, maturity had brought about a change in her attitudes. He offers no facts to substantiate his suggestion. The history of the times and of Lady Mary's life makes such a development highly improbable.³⁰

²⁸ P. 198.

²⁹ *Sidney's Arcadia: a comparison between the two versions* (1929), p. 32.

³⁰ There are two facts, neither of which are mentioned by Dobell, Praz, or Zandvoort (above, n. 4), which lend color to the notion of a change in Lady Mary's attitudes, but which I believe to have no weight in the face of the contrary evidence. The dedications to

Wilton became under Lady Mary's influence a famous center of art and learning, approximating, as nearly as was possible in England, the liberal culture of the Italian courts. The trend in such circles, with the advance in popularity of the new Italian literature and the decline of humanism, was toward an increase in the freedom with regard to sex which has been stated as characteristic of Elizabethan literature. The poems of Lodge, Marlowe, and Shakespeare, mentioned earlier in this article as examples of extreme sensuousness and license, are more nearly contemporaneous with the date of the publication of the *Arcadia* by Lady Mary than with the date of its composition.³¹

One further argument offered by Zandvoort in support of the theory that Lady Mary revised Sidney's text for moral reasons is that "there was a difference between the publicity of print and private circulation in manuscript."³² That Lady Mary was undisturbed by any such con-

Lady Mary and her own literary efforts, chiefly translations, as far as we have record of them, show a serious trend, since many of them are philosophical or religious. (See Frances Berkeley Young, *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* [London, 1912], chap. iv, "Lady Pembroke as editor, translator, and author," and chap. v, "Lady Pembroke as a patron of letters.") Considerable variety also appears, and, after all, it is a far cry from the probable attitude of an intellectual and religious Elizabethan lady to what Praz and Zandvoort term the "bowdlerizing" of Sidney's text.

The second consideration is what might appear to be a parallel to the revision of the *Arcadia* in Sir John Harington's treatment of Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*. In his translation he made Isabella a virgin; whereas Ariosto certainly intended to present her as the wife of Zerbino although not formally married (Canto XXIB, st. 89; st. 73 in the translation). To his translation Harington added an elaborate apparatus of moralization. Although a courtier, Harington's moral effort appears to represent the insincere attempt of a young poet to meet the new middle-class Puritan morality when he presented his work to the public, an enterprise in which he found some intellectual satisfaction once into it. He later referred to his notes with embarrassment as possibly fantastical ("An answer to critics," *Elizabethan critical essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith [Oxford, 1904], II, 221), and his own "Epigrams," published in the same volume with the *Orlando*, and *The metamorphosis of Aiaz* are very far from puritanical. The Countess of Pembroke would hardly be expected to be equivocal, and the reputation of the author of the *Arcadia* needed no bolstering.

³¹ Roger Ascham, a humanist, earlier in the century had condemned the romances of chivalry of his father's time as teachers of nothing but adultery and murder, and the new Italian books as teachers of sin of every kind ("Address to the gentlemen and yeomen of England," *Toxophilus*, and *The scholemaster*, in *English works*, pp. xiv-xv and 230-31). An attack based on moral grounds against poetry in general was proceeding from the rising middle-class Puritanism. But the Countess of Pembroke, as a liberal patron of the new movements in literature, cannot be identified with either of these attitudes. John Aubrey begins a description of the library at Wilton with "Here was a noble librarie off books choicely collected in the time of Mary, Countess of Pembroke. I remember there were a great many Italian bookes; all their poets" (*The natural history of Wiltshire*, ed. John Britton [London: Wiltshire Topographical Society, 1847], p. 86). Nicholas Breton, one of the Countess' literary followers, exalted her above the Duchess of Urbino as a patroness of literature (Dedication to *The pilgrimage to Paradise ioyned with the Countesse of Pembrokes love* [Oxford, 1592]; quoted by Frances Berkeley Young, *Mary Sidney*, p. 159).

³² P. 32.

sideration in connection with the *Arcadia* is reasonably certain from the facts concerning the publication of her brother's sonnets. Three unauthorized editions of *Astrophel and Stella* appeared in 1591. In 1593, according to a statement by R. S. in the preface to the folio *Arcadia*, Lady Mary was planning to publish more of her brother's works. The edition of *Astrophel and Stella* supervised by her appeared in 1598.

Lady Mary's acceptance of the socially most unconventional aspects of her brother's sonnets, for literary representation at least, is established by certain additions and changes in arrangement which she made in the 1598 folio. The "Sonnets of variable verse," printed together after the regular sonnets in the earlier unauthorized editions, she distributed through the regular sonnets, thus incorporating them into the dramatic progression of Sidney's address to Penelope Rich.³³ It is in these irregular sonnets that the theme of a lover endeavoring to win the ultimate favor of a woman married to another man, certainly no more acceptable morally than the Pyrocles-Philoclea episode, is presented most clearly and with most individualizing dramatic detail.³⁴ The irregular sonnet, XI, was added by Lady Mary and should establish the unlikelihood of her deletion of the Musidorus-Pamela episode as a matter of taste, since the sonnet presents a parallel situation.³⁵ Lady Mary also added one regular sonnet, XXXVII, which definitely announces the name of the lady addressed to be Rich.³⁶

Consideration of all the available evidence brings one to the con-

³³ The identification of "Stella" with Lady Rich was recently questioned by James M. Purcell, *Sidney's Stella* (New York and London, 1934). Mr. Purcell's argument is definitively answered, and Penelope Devereux re-established as "Stella," by Hoyt Hudson, "Penelope Devereux as Stella," *Huntington Library bulletin*, No. 7 (April, 1935).

³⁴ Sonnet XI, first published by Mary, and Sonnets VIII and X, to which she added stanzas, are notable in this respect. (Numbered as in the Cambridge ed. of Sidney's *Works*, III, 286 ff.)

³⁵ The lover comes upon his lady sleeping and contemplates attempting to gain what her chastity or disdain had refused him waking. Fear of her anger restrains him to stealing only a kiss. His lady commences to wake, and the lover flees, berating himself as "Foole, more Foole for no more taking."

³⁶ The character of Lady Mary's contribution to the editing of *Astrophel and Stella* indicates that the more intimate sonnets of the sequence had been withheld from circulation, the unauthorized editors apparently having been unable to obtain a complete manuscript (unless they made deletions for moral reasons!), on account of personal considerations until these had become remote by Sidney's death, the separation of Lady Rich from her husband, and the remarriage of Sidney's wife. Lady Mary evidently considered them appropriate to represent her brother as a poet.

clusion that Lady Mary would not, on the grounds of taste or sex-morality, have made the revisions of the *Arcadia* ascribed to her, nor has examination of the data relating to the revisions suggested any other motivation as probable. The external evidence and the textual evidence favor revision by Sidney rather than by his sister. It remains to find adequate ethical or artistic motivation for Sidney to have made the changes in the two passages under consideration.

The evidence from Elizabethan literary and social conventions for the improbability of Lady Mary's having revised the episodes because of any objection to the sex aspects involved applies equally to Sidney. An ethical reason for the changes is, however, inherent in the *Arcadia*. The conduct both of Pyrocles and of Musidorus was faulty with respect to the chivalric ideal which Sidney was presenting. At this point enters a question of Sidney's artistic method for the fulfilment of his ethical purpose. Did he intend his principal heroes (and heroines) to be complete models of conduct or only partial models, whose errors, by punishment, may teach us as well as their perfections? We can find the answer by turning to his statements of theory in the *Defense of poesie* and considering the *Defense* and the *Arcadia* together.

In the *Defense* the evidence is overwhelmingly for the method of perfect models. Sidney attests the value of poetry over history to be that history is bound to nature and can present only partially perfect models for emulation. Poetry "with the force of a divine breath . . . bringeth things foorth surpassing her [nature's] doings . . . since our erected wit maketh us know what perfection is, and yet our infected wil keepeth us from reaching unto it."³⁷ Sidney cites various heroes as representatives of one virtue or another, or of one function, but three

³⁷ *Works*, III, 8-9. Sidney cites examples as follows: Nature has not brought forth "so true a lover as *Theagenes*, so constant a friend as *Pylades*, so valiant a man as *Orlando*, so right a Prince as *Xenophons Cyrus*, so excellent a man every way as *Virgils Aeneas*" (III, 8); and "certainly is more doctrinable, the fained *Cyrus* in *Xenophon* then the true *Cyrus* in *Justin*: and the fained *Aeneas* in *Virgill*, then the right *Aeneas* in *Dares Phrygius*" (III, 16). That perfection was the aim appears in another manner in the following: "But even in the most excellent determination of goodnesse, what *Philosophers* counsaile can so readily direct a Prince, as the feined *Cirus* in *Xenophon*, or a vertuous man in all fortunes: as *Aeneas* in *Virgill*, or a whole Common-wealth, as the Way of Sir Thomas Moores *Eutopia*. I say the Way, because where Sir Thomas Moore erred, it was the fault of the man and not of the Poet: for that Way of patterning a Common-wealth, was most absolute though hee perchaunce hath not so absolutely performed it" (III, 15). By the grouping, the method of a complete model evidently applies to the patterning of a prince and of a virtuous man as well as of a commonwealth.

times he refers to Aeneas as a pattern of the complete virtuous man.³⁸ That the references to Aeneas are to the author's intent, to a literary method, and not a matter of Sidney's own acceptance of Aeneas as a model for a later generation is indicated by a criticism of the ideals of Virgil, and also of Homer, in the *Arcadia*:

and therefore would themselves [Pyrocles and Musidorus] (understanding that King Euarchus was passed all the cumber of his warres) goe privately to seeke exercises of their virtue; thinking it not so worthy, to be brought to heroycall efforts by fortune, or necessitie (like *Ulysses* and *Aeneas*) as by ones owne choice and working.³⁹

Certainly it is to the method of the embodiment of the complete idea in one figure that Sidney, with his devotion to the Renaissance tradition of the whole man, would most naturally be drawn.⁴⁰

That Sidney should present vices as well as virtues, in order to dissuade from them by depicting their punishment, would be expected from the *Defense*. He states this power of poetry always to mete out justice with rewards to virtue and punishment to vices as one of its advantages over history.⁴¹ At the same time, there is evidence that he did not think of the misfortunes which pursued a hero as consequences of errors or failure of complete virtue:

for indeed Poetrie ever sets vertue so out in her best cullours, making fortune her well-wayting handmayd, that one must needs be enamoured of her.

³⁸ In the first passage it is by contrast to heroes representing separate virtues, then "so excellent as a man in every way as *Virgils Aeneas*" (III, 8), and in the second, as "a virtuous man in all fortunes" (III, 15), in contrast to Cyrus, the prince, representative of a function. Finally, the completeness of Aeneas is presented in detail to illustrate the value of heroic poetry: "Onely let *Aeneas* bee worne in the Tablet of your memorie, how hee governeth himselfe in the ruine of his Countrey, in the preserving his olde Father, and carrying away his religious Cereemonies, in obeying Gods Commaunment, to leave *Dido*, though not onelle all passionate kindnesse, but even the humane consideration of virtuous gratefulnesse, would have craved other of him: how in stormes, howe in sports, how in warre, howe in peace, how a fugitive, how victorious, how besieged, how besieging, how to straungers, how to Allies, how to enemies, how to his owne. Lastly, how in his inwarde selfe, and howe in his outward government" (III, 25). The inclusion of Aeneas' leaving *Dido* indicates the breadth of Sidney's acceptance of the method.

³⁹ I, 206. The reference to Aeneas in the passage quoted allies Sidney's method and intention with that of Virgil as he understood them.

⁴⁰ That the character of Sidney was associated with such an idea of perfection in his creations appears in an encomium by Gabriel Harvey: "What should I speake of the two brave Knights, Musidorus and Pyrocles, combined in one excellent knight, Sir Philip Sidney, at the remembrance of whose woorthy and sweete Vertues my hart melteth?" (*Pierce's supererogation*, in *Elizabethan critical essays*, II, 263). The presence of two equal heroes in the *Arcadia* does not involve a departure from the method; each hero is dramatically individualized, but complete in virtue and accomplishments, and the division was necessary for the inclusion of the virtue of friendship.

⁴¹ *Works*, III, 18.

Well may you see *Ulysses* in a storme and in other hard plights, but they are but exercises of patience and magnanimitie, to make them shine the more in the neare following prosperitie.⁴³

The presentation of vices seems to depend in Sidney's mind entirely on a method of division of characters: "If the *Poet* do his part aright, he wil shew you in *Tantalus Atreus*, and such like, nothing that is not to be shunned: in *Cyrus*, *Aeneas*, *Ulysses*, each thing to be followed."⁴³ He includes the method of tragedy, in which whatever virtue the character possesses is overwhelmed by some great vice, crime, or error,⁴⁴ and the method of comedy, in which the common errors of life are represented "in the most ridiculous & scornfull sort that may be";⁴⁵ but to the more subtle distinctions between the acts of men essentially heroes and models of virtue he apparently did not respond. He cites Achilles for valor, but does not mention his anger; and Ajax for anger but not for courage.

The *Arcadia* definitely is constructed for ethical purposes upon a scheme of division of characters. There are more divisions and finer distinctions than appear in the *Defense*, but by elaboration upon rather than departure from the method. The schematic element is unmistakably present, and its basis is a sharp division into characters at one extreme whose actions as a whole are to be followed and those at the other extreme whose actions are presented for detestation. The scheme is complicated but not obscured by the gradations in between. Pyrocles and Musidorus, Philoclea and Pamela, and Evarchus clearly have the function of supreme models of virtue.⁴⁶

Sidney's whole bent in the *Defense* is for clarity of teaching in literature: "the Philosopher . . . is so hard of utterance and so mistie to be conceived, that one that hath no other guide but him shall wade in

⁴³ III, 18.

⁴⁴ III, 16.

⁴⁵ III, 14-15, 23-24.

⁴⁶ III, 23.

⁴⁶ Anaxius and his brothers and Cecropia are examples of vices on the grand scale; Dametas and family and Clinias, on the comic level. In Amphialus we have an example after the method of tragedy. Basilius and Gynecia function as examples of particular errors with their consequences, Philanax, of a particular virtue with marked limitations. These few named are only in illustration of the method; the characters are endlessly divided as to function and repetition of function. There is no lack of dramatic reality and individualization in these figures of Sidney's imagination, as one might expect from the *Defense*. In conjunction with emphasis upon particular errors, vices, or virtues, the secondary characters are very humanly mingled of good and bad qualities, and the heroes and heroines are plentifully supplied with distinctions of personality outside the scope of ethics.

him till he be old, before he shall finde sufficient cause to be honest,"⁴⁷ but "the poet is the food for the tendrest stomachs."⁴⁸ Sidney would not knowingly have left the reader confused as to what conduct was to be followed and what shunned, and he was a careful craftsman. I believe, in the absence of clear indication to the contrary, the basis for ethical study of the *Arcadia* should be the assumption that those characters who are presented as models of virtue as a whole are so intended in particular.⁴⁹

With Sidney's method established, application may be made to the problem of the revisions. The sex aspect of Pyrocles' visit to Philoclea's chamber as presented in the original version did not constitute a flaw in his character; but from the point of view of the active, energetic ideal of knighthood which Sidney intended the two heroes of the *Arcadia* to represent, Pyrocles' conduct on this occasion was frivolous and lacking in magnitude and vigor of purpose. The reflection upon his conduct is implicit in the accomplishment of Musidorus under parallel circumstances. The goal of Musidorus and of Pyrocles was the same: to establish the princesses in their respective kingdoms as their wives. To that end Musidorus created an opportunity for Pamela and himself to escape from Arcadia. In the same situation Pyrocles made an opportunity for himself and Philoclea equally favorable to this larger action, with no other end in view than the consummation of their love for a night, an end desirable in itself, but trivial before the possibility of bringing their love to the consummation of lifelong union. The scene in the revision, in which Pyrocles' purpose is to gain Philoclea enduringly to wife, shows more maturity, with quite as ardent, but a better-proportioned, sense of sex values.⁵⁰ At the same time, the revision is more consistent with the total presentation of Pyrocles as a man of enterprise and daring. Sidney's achievement in

⁴⁷ III, 13-14.

⁴⁸ III, 16.

⁴⁹ Perhaps because of the naïveté of the principle of teaching through perfect models of conduct, Dr. Myrick does not take into account the evidence in the *Defense* which I have cited (cf. *Sir Philip Sidney as a literary craftsman*, pp. 290-92). I hesitate to disagree with Dr. Myrick on a question of Sidney's theory of the heroic poem as enunciated in the *Defense*, as there I am entering the particular field of his sensitive and learned study, but I have found that analysis of the ethics of love and marriage in the *Arcadia* supports the evidence of the *Defense*.

⁵⁰ Zandvoort terms the scene in the revision "anaemic," apparently feeling that it is lacking in sexual robustness.

characterization throughout the rest of the *Arcadia* is such that it is altogether probable he should have perceived the weakness of the original scene and revised it in terms of his general method.

The revision, if conceived for the strengthening of Pyrocles' character, is open to one criticism: the hero goes to sleep.⁵¹ The going to sleep is carried over from the original version, where it seems somewhat more apt, and is probably repeated because some device is needed to bring about the discovery of Pyrocles and Philoclea by Dametas. If Sidney made the revision, it is possible that he would have found a better device later. But there is a parallel in Heliodorus' *Theagenes and Chariclea*, one of the two most important sources for the original version, and renewed consciousness of which is shown in the *New Arcadia*, that is so close as to constitute additional evidence that the revision of the scene was by Sidney.⁵² Lighting on this passage again in the Greek romances might very well have suggested retaining the device of having Pyrocles fall asleep, and the transfer of the lines from the Musidorus-Pamela passage, where elaborate explanation of going to sleep was less needed than for Pyrocles.⁵³

⁵¹ When it becomes apparent that Philoclea is unable to accomplish the flight, and she has fallen asleep, Pyrocles sits beside her on the bed for a time, reviewing the hopelessness of their situation, until he too, wearied with troubles, falls asleep. This seems extremely weak, even though further activity appeared hopeless.

⁵² Theagenes and Chariclea, the hero and heroine of the romance, in the course of their elopement are spending a night in a cave in the midst of great dangers which call for some plan of action; in this situation they are both overcome by sleep. The description in the folio (II, 61) of Pyrocles' falling asleep is taken from a passage in Book IV of the manuscript (IV, 293), where it was applied to Musidorus and Pamela. Sidney's description so closely resembles that of Heliodorus as to suggest Heliodorus as a source for the lines as originally used. The situation of Pyrocles and Philoclea in the folio revision is closer in some respects to that in Heliodorus' romance than is the situation of Musidorus and Pamela.

⁵³ The passage in *Theagenes and Chariclea*, in the translation by Rowland Smith, is as follows:

"But the multitude of their past calamities, the pressure of the present misfortunes, and the uncertainty of what might happen to them, obscured the light, and weakened the force, of their reason. . . . At length . . . Theagenes threw himself on a rock, and Chariclea reclined upon him. In this posture they a long time resisted the attacks of sleep, desirous, if they could, to devise some scheme of action; but, overcome at last with grief and fatigue, they unwillingly yielded to the law of nature, and fell into a sweet slumber from the very excess of sorrow. Thus is the intelligent soul obliged sometimes to sympathize with the affections of the body" (*The Greek romances of Heliodorus, Longus, and Achilles Tatius*, "Bohn's Classical Library," pp. 40-41).

Sidney describes the descent of sleep upon Pyrocles as follows:

"Till looking more neerely into it, and not able to answer the doubts and difficulties he saw therein more and more arising the night being also farre spent, his thoughtes even wearie of their owne burthens, fell to a straying kind of uncertaintie: and his minde standing onely upon the nature of inward intelligences left his bodie to give a sleeping respite to his vitall spirites, which he, according to the qualitie of Sorrow, received with

The episode of Philoclea's chamber as it appears in the manuscript version mars the balance of character which was otherwise uniformly maintained by Sidney between Pyrocles and Musidorus. The revision not only corrects this defect in the carrying-out of the method which Sidney appears to have set for himself, but completes the symmetry of the plot which is otherwise characteristic of the *Arcadia*.⁵⁴ Sidney's method elsewhere is that of parallelism of general situation and purpose for the two friends, with variations in procedure; the revision carries out this method.⁵⁵

The original version of the episode of Pyrocles failed, by inadequacy of characterization, to fulfil Sidney's method of teaching virtue by presenting perfect models for conduct. The episode of Musidorus' contemplated attempt on Pamela's virginity was in direct violation of that method, since Sidney immediately and clearly expressed condemnation of the act in introducing the outlaws as "guyded by the everlasting Justice to bee Chastizers of *Musidorus* broken vowe" (IV, 286). It is the broken vow, not the sex-aspect of the situation, decidedly disagreeable to a modern taste, which Sidney condemned. Neither he nor Lady Mary would have deleted the episode because of offense to Elizabethan taste, but Sidney might very well have made this revision to round out the method of maintaining perfection in the heroes. As an isolated instance, the episode was a flaw in the construction of the original *Arcadia*.

greater greediness than ever in his life before. According to the nature of sorrow, I say, which is past cares remedie. For care sturring the braines, and making thinn the spirites breaketh rest: but those griefes wherein one is determined there is no preventing, do brede a dull heavinesse which easily clothes it selfe in sleepe" (II, 61).

Sleep as a reaction to mental turmoil in an active character occurs also in Malory's *Morte Darthur*, where Sir Launcelot, when he had read a letter speaking shame of Guenever and himself, "was so wroth that he laid him down on his bed to sleep" ([London: Jonathan Cape and the Medici Society, 1923], II, 50 [Book X, chap. xxvii]).

⁵⁴ Zandvoort comments: "Invention does not seem to have been her [Lady Mary's] strong point . . . for she only turned Pyrocles' procedure into a replica of that of his friend; he resolves to carry off Philoclea, just as Musidorus was about to abduct Pamela" (p. 32). Zandvoort disregards the character of Sidney's plot leading up to and following this episode.

⁵⁵ The situations of Musidorus and Pyrocles had already been made so identical in their relations to the two princesses as to demand for consistency that they should alike press forward to the purpose of abduction. The procedure is as different in the revision as that of the manner in which they gained access to their ladies, Pyrocles by disguising himself as an Amazon, Musidorus as a shepherd. It seems to me that anyone reading the *Old Arcadia*, if no revision had ever appeared, might well have felt disturbed by the break in the parallelism of plot and character introduced by the difference of purpose between Pyrocles' visit to Philoclea's chamber and Musidorus' abduction of Pamela.

Structurally and ethically, the revision of the Pyrocles-Philoclea and Musidorus-Pamela episodes carries out the principles represented in Sidney's composition of the *Arcadia* as a whole: the presentation of perfect models of virtue; balance of character between the heroes, Pyrocles and Musidorus; and parallelism of situation and purpose between the heroes, with variation of procedure. No other probable motivation for these revisions has been found; and no one but Sidney himself, unless guided by suggestion from him, would have been likely to have been sufficiently aware of his purposes and methods to have attempted carrying them out by revision. The most reasonable conclusion from the study of the ethical background⁴⁶ appears to me to be that Sidney did some preliminary revision on the *Old Arcadia* before the larger unfinished project of the quarto had developed fully in his mind. If such were the case, no one was more likely to possess the unique manuscript containing these revisions than Lady Mary. Such a manuscript may also have contained notes for intended revisions, or need for further changes for consistency, indications of intention which Lady Mary would have been entirely justified in carrying out.

The theory that Sidney was responsible for revisions in the folio cannot be established beyond question except by the discovery of a definitive contemporary statement or of a revised manuscript in Sidney's hand. The positive evidence appears to me to be complete enough, however, with an entire lack of contrary evidence, to justify accepting the revisions as by Sidney as a basis for any analysis of his thought or art.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

⁴⁶ Supported by study of Lady Mary's editorship and the corpus of revisions (cf. above, n. 5).

HAMLET AND THE SPANISH TRAGEDY AGAIN

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

I

IN THE present article no more than in the former one am I presuming to make contributions to the controversy. What I wish to do is to reinforce the positions of protest I have already taken,¹ and then to show some of the bearings or effects upon the character of Hamlet, of the Queen, and of the King, in Shakespeare's hands.

After considerable exhausting but by no means exhaustive reading I reaffirm the following opinions. The original play, now lost, was by Kyd, the author also of *The Spanish tragedy*. This play was later, and its similarity to Quarto I of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and to *Der bestrafte Brudermord* is not owing, as Sir Edmund Chambers is inclined to think, to its influence upon them but to its being a transposition of the Hamlet story, intended to repeat that success. Quarto I (1603) and the *Brudermord* are not, as Sir Edmund is more than inclined to think, in various ways "based upon derivatives from Quarto 2" (1604). If as the critic holds, and as seems not unlikely, Shakespeare rewrote the original but once, why, then, the purveyor (or else purveyors) of Q₁—actor (or actors) in the capacity of reporter, either also interpolating or else assisted by a "hack poet"—must have had access to the original in some shape or other, and where his memory of the jealously guarded Shakespearean text failed him, must have fallen back upon it. And sometimes, apparently, where his memory did not fail. But he did not so much interpolate as preserve or restore. There was no conceivable reason for the piratical purveyor's giving the book-buyer, who wanted Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, now playing, anything more or other than what he pretended to give, and least of all for troubling himself to rearrange it. The changes in the internal structure, such as the shifting of the nunnery scene and the disclosing (or withholding) of the fact

¹ "Hamlet and the Spanish tragedy, Quartos I and II: a protest," *MP*, XXXV (1937), 31-46.

of the murder in the closet scene and of the King's epistolary perfidy afterward, were, as appears from the internal evidence as well, made by the dramatist in Q_2 , not by the reporter or interpolator in Q_1 .

II

To touch upon these points once more. The hypothesis concerning the identity of the original author, that of the sober and learned Malone, has been confirmed by evidence both internal and external and by the explicit judgment of most competent scholars since. Nash, in the epistle prefixed to Greene's *Menaphon* (1589), points clearly enough to Kyd as the author of the old *Hamlet*, saying nothing (if there was need of saying anything) of his other play for the good reason that it had not yet appeared. Between the Danish and the Spanish tragedies there are more points of resemblance in situation than I had indicated,² most of them noticed by my predecessors, such as the Danish and the Spanish Horatio's friendly devotion even to the death; Hamlet's and the Spanish Horatio's being separated from his sweetheart by her father and brother; Hieronimo's thinking that Bazulto, as he takes him for the ghost of the murdered, had returned to reproach him, like Hamlet's thinking the same when he sees his father's ghost in the bedchamber; and his reconciliation with Lorenzo, like Hamlet's with Laertes. And Sarrazin³ and his successors show many additional points of resemblance in sentiment, wording, and rhythm. Here is one:

Isabella. O wheres the author of this endless woe?
Hieron. To know the author were some ease of greife,
 For in revenge my hart would find releife [II, v, 39].
Laertes (Q_1). Revenge it is must yeeld this heart releefe,
 For woe begets woe, and griefe hangs on griefe [XV, 53-55].⁴

Now skepticism about Kyd's authorship and the theory of imitation of *The Spanish tragedy* in Q_1 are interdependent: if like Sir Edmund and Professor Brandl you entertain the one, you must fall back on the

² On p. 33. In my rehearsal there I failed in the words "with a contrast established between this revenger and another whose son had been murdered" to insert "(or father)" after "son." And on p. 39, eighth line from the foot, "there" should be transposed between "Hamlet" and "is."

³ *Kyd und sein Kreis* (1892). Cf. the numerous parallels in M.B. Evans' *Der bestrafte Brudermord* (1910).

⁴ The references to Q_1 follow William Griggs's photographic reproduction.

other. But for those who, like the majority until swayed by Sir Edmund's pronouncement, feel constrained to accept Malone's hypothesis, the theory of imitation is, on the surface of it, as I said in the earlier article, superfluous, both roundabout and highly improbable. Imitation entails imitation. If that, not Kyd's single authorship for both, is the explanation for the similarity of *Hamlet* to *The Spanish tragedy*, it must in turn be the explanation for the similarity of the latter play to the former. Why, on the one hand, as Sarrazin⁵ said long ago in answer to Brandl, should Kyd, a well-known and successful dramatist, be, in *The Spanish tragedy*, imitating so closely the work of a contemporary dramatist otherwise unknown, whose name has not come down to us? Kyd did not need so to imitate; for when he cares to originate he can, as in the denouement of *The Spanish tragedy*, where, combining play scene and stabbing scene, he springs a surprise by turning mimicry to reality. He repeats himself, as a successful clever dramatist will, but not much more than enough to repeat the success. And why, on the other hand, should a hack poet, an interpolator, or mere reporter of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, be imitating in sentiments, wording, style, and rhythm an old-fashioned play of 1588 or 1589, extraordinarily popular once but, at this stage in the enormously rapid Elizabethan development, already become, as in *Every man in his humour* (1598) and *Cynthia's revels* (1601), a byword for dramatic superannuation? As a byword *The Spanish tragedy* was singled out because, unlike other plays of its day, it still held the boards despite its outmoded sentiments, style, and rhythm—the very points, however, of supposed imitation. In answer to the demand for Shakespeare's jealously guarded version in print, the purveyor was endeavoring to furnish the public with that or an equivalent; and if any style was to be imitated it should have been Shakespeare's own⁶ or else that of Shakespeare's day. If this theory of imitation, indeed, is to prevail, Shakespeare must now, at the height of his fame, have been imitating *The Spanish tragedy* himself. Even in Q₂ stands the couplet

For if the king like not the comedy
Why then, belike, he likes it not, perdy [III, ii, 304-5],

⁵ *Kyd und sein Kreis* (1892), pp. 108-9.

⁶ Sarrazin, *Anglia* (1891), p. 118.

which in situation, sentiment, and phrasing is parallel to Hieronimo's

And if the world like not this Tragedie
Hard is the hap of olde Hieronimo [IV, i, 196-97].

Echo and burlesque in Q_2 , says Sir Edmund. Undoubtedly the Kydian original has in both Q_2 and Q_1 been retouched, yet as the lines stand in *The Spanish tragedy* the echo seems to be Hieronimo's own. In his *Hamlet* Kyd probably wrote "tragedy," as in Q_1 ; and in his second play changed to "world" because there it is not a king that is the murderer, and because the performance to come (not, as in *Hamlet*, just past) is not for detection but for cunning and covert revenge. So the passages above, about "greefe" and "releefe," similar in sentiment, wording, and rhyme, differ because of the situation: Laertes has no mystery to clear up. In the Q_1 closet scene, on the other hand, the parallel (cited in the earlier article, pp. 40-41) between the Queen and Bel-imperia, each promising to "conceale, consent, and do her best," is perfect; and it is a very strange thing that Sir Edmund should think the reporter or an interpolator would thus, and by adding the subsequent plain-spoken colloquy between the Queen and Horatio about the King's epistolary perfidy, go out of his way, in following *The Spanish tragedy*, to the point of reconstruction, changing the relations of the Queen to the King and the Prince as well as the drift of the story.

The critic does not himself entertain so queer a theory as that it was Shakespeare who imitated the superannuated play, knowing full well that Shakespeare, ready at any time to recast an old one, as even the still older *Hamlet* at this moment, always, though sometimes letting effective passages stand pretty much as they were, gave it new form and life. He re-wrote, if he didn't recast; the day was over for imitating Kyd or Marlowe, the day of *Titus Andronicus* and *Henry VI*. The chief point in a new version of what had been a success was the bringing of style and meter up to date—a process which the purveyor of Q_1 would, on this view, be turning round! But the critic does discover, in seven passages besides those cited or referred to above, possible influence of *The Spanish tragedy* upon the memory of an actor either reporting or interpolating. Now there would be nothing im-

probable about his reproducing passages so piquant and colloquial, so congenial to Hamlet's spirit and manner, as

Hieronimo, 'tis time for thee to trudge [into the other world]
[III, xii, 6],

or

And here I'll have a fling at him, that's flat [in the way of
revenge] [III, xii, 21],

or

Why, is not this a miserable thing, my lord? [said in dissem-
bling deprecation] [III, xiv, 133]

(passages that put conceivably within Kyd's reach "For if the king like not the comedy"), not to mention any of the flamboyant or bombastic expressions now being ridiculed by Jonson and others. These would be worth his while! Instead, the seven contain insignificant and unobtrusively similar sentiments and phrases such as, if allowances are made in *Q₁* for the wretched printing, it is far more probable that the same author, taking up his pen anew, would, in like circumstances, unconsciously fall into again:

Balthazar. I [Ay], but perhaps she hopes some nobler mate [*Sp. Tr.*, II, i, 26].

Duke. Thou maist (perchance) have a more noble mate [*Q₁*, IX, 111].

Bel-imperia. Thou has prevailde; ile conquer my misdoubt [*Sp. Tr.*, II, iv, 20].

Laertes. You have prevail'd my Lord, a while Ile strive [*Q₁*, XIII, 122].

Lorenzo. And how for that? [IV, i, 74]

Laertes. And how for this? [*Q₁*, XV, 14]

Lor. O, excellent! [IV, i, 126]

Laertes. 'Tis excellent! [*Q₁*, XV, 37]

(These last four speeches all have to do with plotting, but in *The Spanish tragedy* it is Hieronimo against his enemy, Lorenzo, to whom he is speaking.)

Hieron. To drowne thee with an ocean of my tears [II, v, 23].

Laertes. Therefore I will not drowne thee in my tears [*Q₁*, XV, 53].

Lorenzo. Hieronimo, I never gave you cause [III, xiv, 148].

Ham. I never gave you cause [*Q₁*, XVI, 164].

Castile. But heere, before Prince Balthazar and me
Embrace each other, and be perfect friends [III, xiv, 154-55].

King. Come Gertred, wee'l have Laertes and our sonne
Made friends and Lovers, as befittes them both [*Q₁*, XVII, 8-9].

One can see for one's self that no reader or student of *The Spanish tragedy* would go out of his way to reproduce passages of so little distinction or importance; often it is the similarity of the situation alone that justifies the supposition of a connection of any sort; and for influence of *The Spanish tragedy* upon *Hamlet* (instead of the same author following in a similar situation the line of least resistance) we should have to suppose an actor-reporter who had one (or two) roles by heart. These reminiscences, with the previous ones counted in, are from six.

I have complained of the roundaboutness of Sir Edmund's theory. Sarrazin (pp. 108-9) made the same complaint against Brandl's in 1892. But in the last edition of his *Shakespeare* ([Berlin, 1937], pp. 318-20) Professor Brandl has quite abandoned his position, now accepting Kyd's authorship of *Hamlet* and consequently no longer needing his own complicated machinery.

While I think the imitation theory untenable, I would not, however, be understood to imply that all which is un-Shakespearean in Q_1 is owing either to the garbled report, or to bad printing, or to Kyd. There is room for a hack poet or at least a reporter who at a pinch could versify. There are passages in Q_1 , as Mr. Gray⁷ and others have noted, such as the "To be or not to be" soliloquy, the King's soliloquy before his prayer, and the dozen lines with which the play-within-the-play opens, that, with (in each case) less and less of Shakespeare for their basis, have been penned anew. Some long speeches also are summarized. And even the passages that show no sign of Shakespeare's style, meter, or thought, are, though decidedly primitive, and apparently of 1588 to 1590, nevertheless not necessarily quite Kyd's own. Above I said "had access to the Kydian original in some shape or other," and very possibly that shape was only a scenario and some scattered actors' parts. Further, although the reporter or hack poet would not imitate the early style in this undertaking to pirate the contemporary Shakespeare, but endeavor to do the contrary, he might in his ineptitude fall into such a style unconsciously. A second- or third-rate poet today, unless schooled and steeled against it, writes, however little, more like Tennyson or Swinburne than like Hardy or De la Mare. Second-raters are generally back numbers. Nevertheless, in the passages referred to above, where the hack or the reporter is strik-

⁷ *PMLA*, XLII (1927), 732-33.

ing out a bit for himself, there is nothing that has anything of the flavor or the cadence of *The Spanish tragedy*, apparent enough in the passages cited below.

III

In the matter of the priority of the old *Hamlet*, Professors Brandl and Sarrazin and others have anticipated me, giving, however, other reasons. The most important are the evident signs in *The Spanish tragedy* of pressing the *Hamlet* material into the new mold: there is less reason for a ghost and for feigned madness and none at all for Bel-imperia's reproach of "ingratitude."⁸ Besides, there are several points at which the story resembles that in Belleforest and Saxo more closely than *Hamlet* does in any of the stage versions.⁹ This argument has force, however, only if Kyd is author of both plays. It is the author of the old *Hamlet*, thoroughly familiar with its source, that would afterward, in penning the sister-play, unconsciously bring in bits of the original story, not now before him.

Both Professor Brandl and Professor Evans,¹⁰ again for other reasons than mine, recognize, in *Q₁* and the *Brudermord* alike, the position of the nunnery scene immediately after Polonius brings news of the madness and before the "fishmonger" passage to be that of the original; and they also recognize something I had not noticed, the proper position in those plays of the prayer scene. This, exactly the same in the two primitive versions, is more in keeping with Kyd's simpler but carefully coherent and dramatically accentuated method. The King quits the play in panic and when he next appears is alone, soliloquizing, about to fall on his knees. Hamlet triumphs in his discovery, and when he next appears he comes upon the King in that position. This makes a more direct and pointed contrast than in Shakespeare. There the King, before he takes to prayer, discusses Hamlet's conduct with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, then with Polonius, and he arranges for his despatch to England. Such are the thoughts that, as his words fly up, "remain below." And Hamlet? The thought of revenge, which is openly expressed at the end of the Mousetrap scene in the *Brudermord*, has, in *Q₁* as well as in *Q₂*, been put out of his head by the sum-

⁸ *The Spanish tragedy*, IV, 1, 16.

⁹ Brandl, *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen* (1891), p. 727.

¹⁰ Evans, pp. 58, 63; Brandl, *Shakespeare* (1937), p. 313.

mons to his mother and the question of what he is to say to her. Some critics no doubt would have it that Hamlet is here evading the issue; others, that it is the dramatist who is arbitrarily prolonging his play. In any case Claudius and Hamlet both are thus made more complicated characters; and if the Prince had come so promptly and abruptly upon the King as in *Q₁* and the *Brudermord*, he must needs, for a Shakespeare (as afterward in the closet scene), have killed his man out of hand.

In the *Brudermord* the contrast is still more pointed. At the end of the preceding scene Hamlet, having verified the ghost's words, resolves upon immediate revenge, as he does not in either *Q₂* or *Q₁*. "Von dieser Stunde an will ich darnach trachten, wo ich den König allein finde"—for that he is surrounded by guards is the difficulty repeatedly confronted at the important moments in this version of the story. Now he finds him alone, as he has desired! The presence of guards isn't an appealing or heroic reason for delay, but it plays a part in Belleforest; good dramatic use, to define and emphasize the issue, is here made of it, quite beyond the reach of the helpless German adapter of the story; and we may presume that he is following Kyd. It is a definite, practicable motive, for the delay indispensable to a revenge tragedy, in which the deed must come at the end; though Kyd may have relied also on other considerations in Belleforest—of prudence, so as not to perish himself untimely and in vain, or of the desirability of "a revenge for ever memorable," the villain's own devices being turned against him. And a definite motive a capable but not remarkable dramatist like Kyd must have. But such a motive or motives Shakespeare could not have (though there is something of the *bella vendetta* in the sparing of the King at prayer and in Horatio's penultimate words about "fallen on the inventors' heads") not only because they were unappealing or unheroic but because they reminded the audience, without satisfying them, of the duty undone. For Shakespeare's emotional and dramatic, imaginative, not psychological, purposes it is better that Hamlet should reproach himself and cry, "I do not know," and instead of playing the part of cunning himself, only thwart the villain's cunning.¹¹

¹¹ For the discussion I must refer the reader to the chapter on "Hamlet the man" in my *Shakespeare and other masters*, presently to appear.

IV

The disclosing of the King's epistolary perfidy must have been originally, as in the final version, to Horatio alone (V, 2, 1-74), Sir Edmund presumes, because so it is in the *Brudermord*. Elsewhere the critic thinks little of the *Brudermord* as evidence, and with some reason: the story is not only mutilated and abbreviated but vulgarized, as in *Q₁* it is not. Yet, in its shortened form, it manages to hold together. No revealing of the murder in the closet scene, consequently no promise of concealment and assistance, consequently, again, no later discussion of the Prince's experience and the King's villainy between Horatio and the Queen! Much else is lacking in the *Brudermord* as well; and no argument can be made out of its absence. Far less than from what is wanting in *Q₁*, for not only is it a very much shorter play, but also, in the latter part of it, much of the original action is replaced by vulgar or silly clownage. It is because of the curtailment that the story at the point in question resembles the story in *Q₂*. The Queen not knowing of the one murder, Horatio cannot tell her of the attempted second, and therefore for our behoof must himself be told by Hamlet before us; but the same position as in *Q₂*, the second scene of Act V, means nothing except numerically. In the *Brudermord* there has been and is to be no quarrel with Laertes, also no graveyard scene, and Ophelia is not yet dead.

In general, the *Brudermord* or *Q₁* is evidence for the old play, not when either lacks something contained in *Q₂*, but only when it contains something lacking in *Q₂*, above all when in this respect they agree with each other or with the other derivatives from the old *Hamlet*, Marston's *Antonio's revenge* (1599) and *The Spanish tragedy*, or with Belleforest. But evidence they then are, and it seems to me quite illogical to deny the import of agreement in differences such as the position of the nunnery scene and the prayer scene, which, if only because of the broken links left in *Q₂*,¹² make *Q₁* and the German play superficially more coherent; or such as the King's plotting *all* the villainy at the fencing match, without indebtedness to Laertes for the poison on the rapier; or such as the continual use of "father" and "son"

¹² See *MP*, XXXV, 36: Polonius' "Come go with me. . . . Come go we to the King. . . . Come," and to the King Ophelia does not go (II, i, 101 ff.).

as terms of address by Hamlet and Claudius;¹³ or such as the name of Corambis (or Corambus) for Polonius, which the "reporter" or interpolator of Shakespeare's play would have had no reason for changing, and the German adapter would have had not only no reason for changing, either, but, unless he had had something of the Kydian text before him, no way of doing it so as to match. How can all these differences have been owing to deviation from Q_2 , independently thus agreeing? Particularly since as in the first two examples there is thereby made an approach to a simpler and more primitive or even childish form of art such as Kyd's, despite its theatrical effectiveness, is. And when we consider the closet scene in Q_1 , with the revealing of the murder, the Queen's asseveration of her innocence, her promise to conceal and assist, with conduct accordingly afterward, all so similar¹⁴ to the performances of hero and mother or hero's sweetheart in *Antonio's revenge*, *The Spanish tragedy*, and *Belleforest*, we cannot but arrive at the same (though a clearer) conclusion. The later report of the King's epistolary perfidy to the Queen is then necessary and the telling of it afterward anew to Horatio superfluous. It is impossible that reporter or interpolator, even if so strangely disposed, should himself have revised the play so completely and so coherently in consonance with the old story and its derivatives, and still more impossible that it should have turned out, in the matter of the Queen's innocence, to be "an accidental emphasizing of Shakespeare's own intention."¹⁵

V

Above I have added to the evidence in the previous article for a greater delicacy in Shakespeare's than in Kyd's treatment not only of the Queen but, in their relations to her, of the King and the Prince. To all three he has given less of unfeeling frankness, more of reticence and delicacy, or else he exhibits more reticence himself. In Q_2 , also, the Queen is not made guilty of her husband's death; but there the question does not arise, for she is not told of the murder. In *Belleforest*, *Antonio's revenge*, *The Spanish tragedy*, and the *Brudermord* alike there is, in various ways and in various degrees of completeness, an effect of frankness and confederacy that breaks in upon the dignity

¹³ *MP*, XXXV, 45.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

¹⁵ *William Shakespeare* (1930), I, 420.

and pathos of the avenging hero's isolation, and (what is more) that would, in a higher form of art, be embarrassing to him and also to the dramatist by making the delay more conspicuous, the hero's conduct more unreasonable or unheroic. And since the Queen cannot play the role of confederate as she does in *Belleforest*, as the corresponding female figure does in *Antonio's revenge* and *The Spanish tragedy*, and as she herself in some way or other must have done in Kyd's version, it is better that she should, as in Shakespeare's, remain in ignorance. In Q_1 she is, by her indignation, morally superior but less consistent, for she does no more for her son than in Q_2 except to deceive her husband more circumstantially in her report of the meeting in her closet. In the colloquy about the King's epistolary perfidy with Horatio, missing in Q_2 , her anger with her husband and her sympathy with her son are heightened; but she "will soothe and please him for a time," which means that her subsequent amicable relations are quite hypocritical. They are futile also, are to no avail. The latter part of Q_1 is especially defective, but even with allowances for that the situation throughout is preferable in Q_2 . In her presence the King there shows only the manly and affectionate side of his character to her, only a friendly and paternal attitude to her son. The Queen is called "dull" by Professor Bradley, evidently because she does not see through her mate; but in Q_1 she should seem much duller, for despite the knowledge imparted by her son and by Horatio she does not, as he and Hamlet do, suspect the fencing match. In Q_2 she is no duller than Emilia or any of the others who do not see through Iago; the Queen's want of penetration is like the Court's at the theatrical performance, and the one counteracts or neutralizes the other: if the Queen is stupid the whole Court is, and so neither is, perspicacity not being in question. By reticence and evasion, moreover, Shakespeare succeeds in keeping a point of comparative repose in the tragic story—one of the chief characters in it unaware. She is (yet only by description and implication) sensual and pleasure loving, but she is also sensitive and affectionate, attached to her husband but not much less to her son and to Ophelia, her choice as well as his. She shrinks from sorrow or the sight of it, but not from danger, standing up for her husband against the insurrection and siding with her son at the fencing bout. And she has a woman's and a mother's ways. She wants the Prince beside her at the

theatrical performance. She scatters flowers on Ophelia's corpse, saying she had hoped to deck her bridal bed. She wipes her son's hot face and drinks to him at the combat.

The King, too, is given greater reticence and refinement, both character and situation being again more complicated. In previous studies¹⁶ I have shown that, especially by Shakespeare's keeping the most important test of Hamlet's lunacy (the nunnery scene), in which the King himself participates, for the last, he has been made continually more alarmed and dangerous. In Q_2 he four times menaces his nephew with deportation—after the nunnery scene, after the Mouse-trap, and twice after the death of Polonius—whereas in Q_1 , twice only, the death as the pretext, and after the nunnery scene there he could not well have been much alarmed, since in the sounding he permits Polonius and then the schoolfellow pair to follow him. At first the threats in Q_2 are guarded, but they are steadily less so, and thus the tension of the succeeding scenes before Hamlet's departure is heightened. In the earlier versions effects not only are not so gradual and cumulative but also are not so subtle. In both Q_1 and the *Brudermord* the King's fell intentions upon the Prince's life appear even in the presence of the Queen; and Hamlet in turn, with his mock-mad sarcasms, spares the Queen less face to face. In both, as not in Q_2 , it is in her presence, as the King is particularly hypocritical and menacing, that the Prince insists on his "farewell, mother," with the jest about man and wife as one flesh.¹⁷ And in the mutilated and defective Q_1 , even after his departure, there are two passages, missing in Q_2 and the Folio, where the King shows his evil purposes in talking with the Queen so that the audience at least shall plainly perceive them. Both are early in style and rhythm as well as in the crude villainy of the sentiment, and, like most of the passages listed by Sir Edmund as "un-Shakespearean"¹⁸—pre-Shakespearean he will not call them—as well as those listed as "imitated" from *The Spanish tragedy*, are in much better state of preservation, as if not at all at the mercy of the reporter's hesitating memory or feeble invention. The one is in fourteen lines of talk between the royal pair, which come just before Ophelia's

¹⁶ Cf. my *Hamlet* (1919), pp. 30-34.

¹⁷ *MP*, XXXV, 44-45.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41; Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (1930), I, 419.

first appearance in her madness and are replaced in Q_2 by the conversation between the Queen, Horatio, and a Gentleman:

Hamlet is shipt for England, fare him well,
I hope to hear good news from thence ere long,
If everything fall out to our content . . . [XIII, 1-3].

The other is in a passage of eleven lines, at the end of the graveyard scene, after Hamlet's exit. The Queen has excused him to Laertes and the King joins in:

My lord, 'tis so: but wee'le no longer trifle,
This very day shall Hamlet drink his last . . . [XVII, 2-4].

What news, what drink he means, we in the audience know. And the latter scene now ends with a reference to a meeting of reconciliation, that is, with a fencing match for which in Q_2 and the Folio Gertrude is left unprepared. Another broken link in Q_2 which, however, if Sir Edmund had taken notice of it, would, on his view, have been mended in Q_1 by the pernickety reporter or interpolator. If Q_2 is complete, Shakespeare broke the link in the interest of the Queen's reputation for perspicacity and of her concern for her son. And in Q_2 , as we have seen already, there was less need of breaking it.

VI

Other broken links remain in Q_2 , such as the "repelling" of the Prince's letters, which Ophelia tells Polonius she had done as he had charged her, but which in this version, unlike Q_1 , she had not been charged to do. And among the "un-Shakespearean" passages in Q_1 Sir Edmund does not include the "Hamlet is shipt" one, as well as the following, which to my thinking are equally impossible for Shakespeare's pen at this time, or perhaps at any: VI, 1-8; VII, 1-8; VIII; XI, 102-4; XV, 1-12, 20-27. The colloquy between Horatio and the Queen about the King's perfidy he does not list because it is "due to an alteration." He considers it, like the structural differences discussed above and in the previous article, to be the work of the reporter or interpolator. This, however, is not a case of shifting but of insertion or (I myself would say) retention, and certainly it is in early style, like all the other passages not represented in Q_2 . The strange thing is that the

interpolator should not only join so well but match besides. The passage (XI, 106-7),

I will conceale, consent, and doe my best,
What stratagem soe're thou shalt devise ,

the critic lists quite properly not only under those "influenced" by *The Spanish tragedy* but also under the "un-Shakespearean." Under neither heading does he list XI, 102-4:

And mother, but assist mee in revenge,
And in his death your infamy shall die.

And yet under the un-Shakespearean he does list XI, 93-95, in which the Queen asserts her ignorance and innocence, ending thus:

But Hamlet, this is only fantasie,
And for my love forget these idle fits.

All three passages have no equivalent in Q_2 or the Folio, are out of keeping with the story in either, but quite in keeping with one another and with the whole story in Q_1 . And if they are not all three from the same hand or of the same period—and that pre-Shakespearean too—for style or rhythm I must simply have no ear. Sir Edmund, everyone knows, has one, as well as other considerable faculties; and few, I think, are so well fitted to hear my plea for Kyd and the partial priority of Q_1 against him as Sir Edmund himself.¹⁹

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

¹⁹ Since the above was submitted for publication Parrott and Craig's *Hamlet, second quarto* (1938) has appeared, in the introduction to which the editors express similar opinions concerning the relations of Q_1 to Q_2 and to the original of Thomas Kyd. They call attention to the correspondence between the King's suggestion of a poisoned rapier among the foils and the stage-direction in the *Brudermord* for Laertes to drop his foil and pick up the poisoned weapon. This, as they say, could not be a misunderstanding of Shakespeare. And they observe that the divergence between the lines of the Player King and Queen and those of their equivalents in Q_1 is too wide to be due to misreporting (pp. 27-29).

A ROMANTIC CORRESPONDENCE OF
THE YEAR 1729

HELEN SARD HUGHES

THE countess of Hertford (1699-1754), Lady of the Bed-chamber to Queen Caroline, loved better than Royal drawing rooms the rural seclusion of her "Hermitage" in Windsor Forest.¹ "Nothing can be pleasanter than this place," she wrote her mother from Richmond on May 22, 1722. "Every Field looks like a Garden and there is not a lane which I do not think preferable to the Mall in St. James's Park spight of all the fine folk one might expect to meet wth there."² Weary of a society where

Snuff or the fan supply each pause of chat,

she sought the seclusion of her "closet"; there she might read, meditate, and write the many letters and verses which she exchanged with particular friends who shared the real interests of her life.

Nature, poetry, and religion, these—after her family—were her chief concerns. The friends with whom she discussed them included romantic young poets, clergymen of divers brands of faith, and a group of women friends, distinguished and otherwise, alike only in their devotion to the Countess.³ Among her obscure correspondents was Mrs. Arabella Marrow of Off-Church, Warwickshire, an old family friend, who eagerly inquired Lady Hertford's opinion of the new book, *Robinson Crusoe*, which Lord Hertford was reading aloud in the evenings while the ladies of his household worked at their embroidery.⁴ And there was also Miss Grace Cole, a sentimental devotee, who figures only transiently in the list of Lady Hertford's correspondents. Miss Cole's voluble letters are significant, however, for the very insignificance of the writer. In her undistinguished communications she evinces unmistakable evidences of a "sensibility" not prevalent in

¹ She was the patroness to whom Thomson dedicated his *Spring* in 1728; one of her country residences was at St. Leonard's Hill in Windsor Forest. Here Thomson visited her in 1731.

² *Percy family letters and papers* (Alnwick MSS), Vol. XXIII (1713-24).

³ The list includes James Thomson, Isaac Watts, Elizabeth Rowe, the Countess of Pomfret, Lady Luxborough, Shenstone, etc.

⁴ *Percy family letters and papers* (Alnwick MSS), XXII (1711-34), 199.

the year 1729 and of a view of life which she herself apologetically admits to be "romantic." On more than one occasion she displays a brand of taste which must have been denounced as "Gothic" by any respectable critic of the Age of Pope; and her rhapsodies and introspections, self-conscious, overstepping the boundaries of common sense, bear the opprobrious marks of "enthusiasm."

In London Miss Cole associated with genteel society, and had occasionally the proud fortune to find herself in the company of a literary celebrity. Yet at other times she followed her father cheerfully into a country exile in Berkshire, there to luxuriate in romantic melancholy and in such adventures as nature and solitude were calculated to provide. She rises at five, an incredible performance for a woman of fashion, and "rambles" in the dewy "Wilderness," noting the seasonal changes in her garden and the charms of a country landscape. Before Gray had established the fashion, she visits country church-yards and gazes reflectively upon the distant prospect of Windsor Castle. These delights she describes rapturously in her letters to her noble friend at a time when "the beau monde class" (the phrase is her own) in general were quoting epigrams, listening to Italian singers, and discussing *Gulliver's travels* (1726) or the *Beggar's opera* (1728).

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[London (?)]

Tis happy for me that I am allow'd to forget the distance I ought to observe whilst writing to your Ladyship. for how could I express the joy, the Innate pleasure, your letters give me and not fall into all the Natural Epithets of an uncommon esteem, and a grateful friendship. Respect (and no more) is but a very faint resemblance of what my Honest Soul must ever retain for my Dear, my Honour'd, and I can't but add, My Charming, Lady Hartford, but if I should grow Impertinent one small reproof, or even your Silence, would humble and sufficiently punish me, but may I never deserve so great a correction as the latter, 'tis now the Silent Night maintains Her Empire, when happy Mortals (tho: none so blest as I am) are Calmly laid to rest. I have this moment been reading your letter and find a thousand new beautys undiscerned before. sure your Soul not only dictated but

yr Gardian Angel⁵ guides your pen, your Letters are your Self, and I may justly quote some lines that are very well adapted to my thought

And yet I see I find each moment more
In thee some merit undiscern'd before
I can't express it but I wish to be
Somewhat above the World to equal thee

I could dwell forever on the whole, and yet am quite calm and happy at reading each single paragraph. The song that has the first place in it⁶ is something more than is generally found in those sort of Complaints. The Heart was not at ease that dictated those lines, I could almost say they seem to weep their wrongs how charming is the thought Immortal flames know no decay, and sure Immortal must be their reward who prove it, depend on my fidelity, it never shall be publick by any means and all you are so vastly good to bestow on me with that Caution is as sacred as truth it Self, but I must humbly beg few very few persons may have the same, for if any should ever come to light (at least till yr Ladyship knows me)⁷ only think how wretched I should be. I had not the Honor of your Ladyships letter till after eleven having been out the whole day and tomorrow (or rather this) morning My Pappa and Self go into Berkshire the Chariot is order'd at five, but shall not rob me of a pleasure the whole World cou'd not attone for, I am sorry My Maid has been so superficially car'ful to carry away the Key of my writing desk (a new care) for this is the Indian Ink I draw with and doubt you will scarce be able to read it. See Madam how freely I talk on, yet still preserve, the value in My Soul. Love and respect are often joyn'd and give me leave to say esteem refines the difference which we by duty pay to Crowns and Greatness. I feel tis Lady Hartford that condescends to make me more than Empress of the World. I am very happy that you like the verses of my friend and am determin'd to show you the whole copy the very first kind opportunity the person that wrote them is

⁵ Verses in Lady Hertford's commonplace-book, apparently of her composition, begin:

"I own I scarcely can forbear
T'invoke my guardian angel's care"
(Alnwick MS, No. 115, fol. 24).

⁶ Apparently Lady Hertford had inclosed in the letter verses of her own composition. In one of her commonplace-books is a "Song" beginning

"Not this blooming Aprill season
Can relieve my aching heart"
(Alnwick MS, No. 116, fol. 60).

⁷ Evidently Miss Cole is a new acquaintance.

lost to almost every Joy in Life. I remember her writing four lines as we were trying pens one evening

Oh Love thou sweetest ill, thou pleasing pain
Thou Merchants Treasure & thou Mizers gain
Thou Freedom thou enslaver of the Mind,
Curst Tyrant, yet the Gentlest friend we find.

I cou'd not but read them two or three times and thought them easy and natural. Yes, Lady Hartford, there is a sorrow which soothes the Soul and is Infinitely preferable to all the Mirth and Gayity in the World. I have sent you a little Song to Melancholly a good deal appropos tho: I know it has been made almost these three years. Oh Lady Hartford how vastly happy shall I be if ever I can ramble about some Church yards with you 'tas been long a favorite amusement with me. I here transcribe you a discription of a Village Church, and Church Yard.

Silent Her tow'rs arise in awfull state
with beauteous plainness elegantly neat
White Walls enclose the sacred spot of ground
And all the little Cells of Death surround
Within their limits, rev'rend to the view
Tall Groves arise of thick inwoven yeugh
beneath whose sable shade in Common Lyes
The poor remains of former Obsequies
Their rural virtues fill the vulgar stone
And simple Honesty is truly shown
The Countrey Poet sings a Countrey theme
And Leaves, His wit to Pair His fellows Name
High on an Eminence these piles appear
And seem to stand in Consecrated Air
So fitly temper'd and so Calmly fine
It breathes and Mingles with the rites divine
And humble purity of Holy Grace
Shines round and seems adapted to the place
As if for Speculative Souls design'd
To form a Sancity of Soul and Mind.^a

These seem to be sort of Indulgences to our last and therefor I send them but if I may speak the truth we dont want nursing however tis hard indeed if form must always fetter the Will, retirmnt was certainly design'd for all the Innocent delights of a rationall Soul, and I

^a I suspect this and other verses of being Miss Cole's own compositions.

take contemplation to be one of the high ones, but tis cruel hard to act the part you mention and happy for Lady Hartford that She has the best understanding in the World, for give me leave to say nothing else could carry you through with it with much Generall applause. I am growing sawcy again, but 'tis really fact how Charmingly you talk upon friendship. That is a subject few people can give fresh beautys too, and yet whilst I am reading your Sentiments, I find Graces that I have never else where met with, and gladly joyn you that Life without it is not worth the keeping. You are naturally good in defering your Wintry wishes upon the Account of the Harvest I own I think there is something vastly solemn in a kindly Autum to see the wither'd leaves catching at evry twigg to live a little longer and when Hollow winds begin to whistle and a long evenings rain drops on some pavement near a window, it all soothes Charmingly. Surely Lady Hartford if people did not prohibit thinking, all these things would not be so dreadfull, for returning Seasons kept their courses when Quadrill Assemblys Farces and all the Train of Time Killers (as they are call'd) were not so charitable as to cheat us of our reason. Yr verses that begin Hence murmuring thoughts⁹ would calm a thousand thousand ills to rest. I could read them for ever, and to repeat them alone will be one of my principal entertainments. Sure it cannot be profane to say they are Divine. The little ballad as you call it is vastly pretty. I must send you another little fragment of poetry

Thy tun'full Language happily exprest
Sooth'd ev'ry Passion in my Warring breast
My soul when e're you Spake became more gay
And Lessn'ing ills flew hastily away.
Of Long enduring patience shewn in Grief
On true Contentment and divine relief
You spake the dictates of a Heav'nly mind
Good as a Saint and as an Angel kind

The application is easily made. Dear Lady Hartford forgive blots faults and libertys of every kind for upon my word tis almost three 'oth clock, and I must rise soon after four, if I can but dream of you in that Hour the Happiness of my Night will be compleated. I answer [assure?] Madam, My Pappa has the Honor to be your Lady-

⁹ Elizabeth Rowe quotes "a Translation from the Italian done by Lady Hartford," which begins, "Hence murmuring thoughts no more my peace molest" (*Miscellaneous works* [1772], II, 325-26).

ships most obedient humble servant, if you will be so good to bestow a letter upon me, Please to direct it Here. I have taken Care it may be safely sent me, & I shall be in Town my self in about a week. I now grow encroaching enough to beg a thought sometimes as the most gratefull of

Madam

Your Ladyship obediently
Devoted humble servants
Grace Cole

Dear Dear Lady Hartford
Adieu September the 2nd¹⁰

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[From Berkshire ?
ca. Sept. 9]

[First page of MS missing]

. . . . I get out and Ramble by my self every morning at five or six o' th clock. tis charming sweet and free from all disturbers. The dew decks every Green with many Gems and the gay happy birds are singing their little Hymns of Joy. The sheep are feeding near me and through the whole Garden is a Visito [*sic*] that directs the eye to Windsor Castle, don't think me the most romantic Creature Living. tho: I own my self a little turnd that way. . . .¹¹

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[Berkshire]
September the 17th

I am sincere when I assure my ever dearest Lady Hartford my happiest employment is writing to her and one of my truest pleasures receiving your letters. I think the day always very long when I expect to hear from you, and to use your own words (tho: much juster apply'd) you have spoil'd my relish to all other letters and yours I cou'd read for ever. I often check myself for giving so far into happiness as I do from the friendship you Honor me with and may very well say with

The World which seem'd a Trifle to my view
Is less Dispis'd since 'tis adorn'd by you

¹⁰ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII (1711-34), 120.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

I profess myself free from spleen or vapours whilst I am confessing I
dout delight in many things in it

The only joys I here on earth approve
Is faithful friendship and Ideal Love.

with never fading Glory, I repeat there is a Harmony in our Souls we
cou'd not otherwise have done, already the work of an age Established
friendship, and one that cannot vary. See if I dont obey you as to
all ceremony. I know obedience is better than Sacrifice and I really
should find vast difficulty in treating you with all the little outward
Forms, that as you say too often supply the want of friendship and
sincerity. Dont talk of my partiality nor think I am fond of Im-
aginary perfections No give me leave to tell you nothing but real
merit can engross My Love, chide not My vanity for seeming to have
pick'd an agreeable set of people out of that little number who visit
me to herd with, I think I have done that, when I speak of Loving,
it is something more than a general affection, 'tis a voluntary tribute
that can be pay'd but to a very few amongst which my Dear Charm-
ing Friend is become a principal Creditor. I am yet kept in Berkshire
but Fryday next I go to Town unless prevented by some accident as
yet unforeseen. I thank you with vast pleasure for allowing me to
see the Servant you mention. I take it as a Distinguishing mark of
your Affection and Love her from your Character of Her already. She
is truly valuable for She has taken care of you. I wont fail to send to
your house Saturday morning, and hope I shall see the person (that
perhaps I may envy) very soon after. Tis happy for me if I can dis-
pell one care where I wou'd gladly share in all. Yes my Dear Generous
friend you have not an anxious thought I would not [be] pleased [to]
devide for

What forse has friendship on the gen'rous heart
When rais'd by merit Cherished by desert
That tis a tast of Heavenly Joys we know
And sent to bless poor Mortals here below.

forgive me for stealing and using the expression Generous Heart, yet
if Honesty Gratitude and truth. . . .

[portion of letter missing]

. . . . to steal upon your mind about your Dear little Angel Lord
Beauchum,¹² depend upon it whatever happens for him will be best:

¹² George Seymour Lord Beauchamp, born 1725, died of smallpox in Bologna in 1744
when he was completing the Grand Tour.

this calm way of speaking does not drift from Insensibility for (tho: never a Mother) I feel with you and would only wish to arm you from fear as it has often hurt but never yet (I believe) was of any service. I dare hope he will scape the small pox. I own all that relates to you demands an Uncommon tenderness and (forgive the freedom) I love the Child Entirely, And what is friendship without the soul and all Her Inmost Wishes, you give too great a proof of the woes you feel for me in what your last tells me, and I find I shall soon wish you could be less good, let me conjure you in the words of another friend of mine

Whatever weight of woes I'm doom'd to bear
 Let not Thy Gentle Soul demand Her Share
 When God Indulgent to the good below
 In mercy bids rewarding blessings flow
 for thee be som'thing won-drous good design'd
 Some happy lot Consistent with they kind.

* * * * *

I am sure I have a very great pleasure to come in reading Milton's (il Penserose) I did not so much as know the Poem was in English but will be sure to get it very soon. The lines you transcrib'd are realy very good, and as you say, inspire one with Solemn thoughts. I cannot possibly promise my self so high a degree of happiness as ever paying you my duty at Marlborough,¹² but the first moment you give me leave after you come to Town I shall certainly attend you. This will seem a very long Month besides the cruel part of the next that must be tacked to it. I cannot but say with Dryden

Fly swift ye hours you measure time in Vain
 Till you bring back my (charming) friend again
 Be shorter now and to redeem that wrong
 When She and I are met be twice as long.

I sent you four lines in my last, more belongs to them that I dont think Mal apropos to the present Situation of my own mind.

Alas how much the people err who say
 The Hours in merry Circles dance away
 They talk of pleasure and the summer prime
 And Gay at heart they court and flatter time
 They Compliment him with a thousand things
 And paint his Lingring Steps with Boyish wings

¹² Marlborough Castle, a country estate in Wiltshire belonging to Lord Hertford's father, the sixth Duke of Somerset, was allowed Lord and Lady Hertford for a residence.

Whilst he with Heavy feet can hardly move
 They dress him like the Babie God of Love
 But I, who joy to find a Minute Gone
 And Cry Thank Heav'n another follows on
 Can all his weary pleasures plainly tell
 And count the tedious length of time for well
 A sad Amusement which I never knew
 Till now I've learn't it from the Lips of you.

They are the Natural Complaint of an Opprest Heart.

I long to see the Book you are so good as to intend me a sight of, I am just come in from Rambling Among the Trees & Bushes in the Wilderness. The Birds have afforded me some of their little Songs but faintly sing as if Nature foreboded the Wintery distresses of certain Cold and Hunger which now is very near them. The Leaves begin to Sicken and look pale. The Wind with cruel force tears from the trees. Their summer Glorys and all the pleasures of the gayer Season give way to a hoary Winter. Dont think me fickle for talking in this way after I have already told you I thought with you as to the decline of the year. I really do so, but Love to view things in every light I can. Accept a little song to the tune of fond ecchos

Ye Rivers that Murmuring flow
 Ye Warblers that sing in the Grove
 Some Pitty allow to my Woe
 And sooth the sharp Torments of Love
 Ye Zephirs that cheerfully play
 See if ye can lull my Despair
 Then on your soft pinions convey
 A Tale of the sorrows I bear

I beg a General pardon for scribbling as I have done since I came into Berkshire, but never was such a set of pens as I have met with. My ever Dearest kind friend may depend upon never sitting alone when She pleases to command me if 'tis in my power to be happy. As to My Pappa seeing your letters you may be easy and assured that He does not. I cant but say he is very good upon those scores. I shall never follow an Inclination that thwarts Him in the Contracting a friendship (of any kind) but when that is done what ever happens in it, is sacred and never to be devulg'd even though I had a better Self. I have yet a thousand things to say but the horrid coach is ready to carry me to a Visiting and all the Company waits for me but I will tell you first that

a Country Sunday was ever my delight. You know I am never so perfectly happy as when you Indulge me with a letter. Till next I have one, I must tear myself from a penly converse tho: my heart will hold many long discourses with you for there you reign La Mia Stella Carisima, Mia Amata bene

Addio

I rejoyce you are better¹⁴ and earnestly Intreat my kind condescending friend will take care of Her health. You may give the song to any body but not tell from whom you had it. . . .¹⁵

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[London] Sept. 23, 1729

. . . . how good you are in saying you wou'd give up some hours Sleep, to ramble with me in my Darling Wilderness. I cou'd upon those terms gladly wish my self again in Berkshire only I shou'd fear your taking Cold, and rejoice heartily that you did not, when the rain caught you, the other day. I cannot say but the adventure seem'd a little Romantic, but where was y^r K^t Errant, that shou'd have led you to a neighbouring Castle, or so forth. . . . [I am sending] Doctor Parnels Works which I don't remember to have heard you mention. . . .¹⁶

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[London] Sept. 30

. . . . I have often wish'd (tho fear'd) to tell you I find the essence of poetry in all your Lines, they flow sweeter than Wallers and strong as Denhams. . . . I do aver, every thing you write in Verse or prose is delightfully Charming, my whole Spirit and attention reads with me, and y^r letters give me spirits in the Morning, and hush my sorrows to a Calm when I have parted from the Noisy World, and am got alone in my quiet room (where rattling Coaches cannot din my ears) I as constantly read some of them as I rise and go to Bed. I believe I need not tell you I was in a high degree of happiness when you gave me a Key to the Two Characters in the Book¹⁷ that upon my

¹⁴ Lady Hertford had been seriously ill in 1728, threatened, according to one letter, with consumption.

¹⁵ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII, 132.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 140-41.

¹⁷ Elizabeth Rowe's *Letters moral and entertaining* (Part I, [1729]).

word were my Principle favourites, and I do assure you I had read Cleoras Letters¹⁸ ore and ore with vast pleasure, and thought they were wrote in a stile, more like yours then any I had ever seen. I own I thought no more, but now I can scarce forgive my self for not being self convinced that they could not be pend by any Body but you. however they are now as Dear to my eyes as they were before beautiful, and for the secret I may say with Otway far from my Lips I'll keep the Secret close nor breath [*sic*] it softly to my self alone. . . . I am vastly pleased with the definition of a sigh¹⁹ and must be of y^r authors opinion they often supply the want of Words, though I fancy most people will allow that they are sometimes very powerfull Orators. I shall be glad to see the book you mention. . . .²⁰

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[Through an acquaintance with the family of Pope's friend Charles Caesar, Treasurer of the Navy under Queen Anne, Miss Cole had the good fortune to meet the leading poet of the age. Lord Oxford wrote Pope in a letter dated October 9, 1729, "Young Mr. Caesar is married to a very great fortune, and much to the satisfaction of his father and Mother."²¹ An account of this event much richer in romantic circumstance Miss Cole communicates to Lady Hertford.]

[London, October 11]

. . . . I want to tell you some news, something odd for me to mention news but this pleases me vastly Young M^r Caesar married a pretty agreeable Girl last fryday with thirty thousand pounds Twas quite a Love story She rose from Her Guardians Table (who was M^r Freeman,) the moment she had dined and with Coll^l Creamers Daughter who was the Companion of Her flight Walked near a Mile where Charles was waiting fr Her with a Coach and My Pappa (who he beg'd in friendship to go with Him) and away they wheel'd and was married. They came to Town Saterday Miss Vane²² and I pay our complim^{ts} to the bride the same evening and Sunday we dined to-

¹⁸ Cleora's letters to the author were anonymous contributions of Lady Hertford's; see below.

¹⁹ Was this Lady Winchelsea's poem?

²⁰ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII, 147-49.

²¹ Elwin-Courthope, VIII, 260.

²² The maid of honor?

gether Here, Anthony²³ was there Saturday and I never saw greater Joy (of the kind) in any one face in My Life. . . .²⁴

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

London, October ye 14th 1729

Thanks and Eternal Gratitude attend my most engaging of friend for her last letter Miss Vane is vastly obliged by y^r kind concern desires me to tell you so, and to offer her humble Service. She is much better but yet too far from well, however, I venturd to spend this one day in Town with poor Miss Caesar who keeps her bed in a feaver but Doctor Mead seems to think she is not in danger. I own I hope she is not for few young Women has more good qualities. Mrs. Caesar Insisted upon my dineing with her below Stairs. Mr. Pope dined with us was in quite a Gay Humour and consequently most Charming Company. He set up my vanity, for to tell you the truth less from him will do it then from any of the Beau Monde Class. I have inquir'd about Anthony and am told He has not broke His Arm at which I realy rejoyce, for as you say 'tis terrible for those poor wretches to have accidents of that kind. I am very Impatient to hear how you got off Saterdag 'twas surely a day of thourough fatigue I hope no Cold stalk'd behind it too, and I humbly beg you will be so good to tell me how Lady Betty bore it. I hope you had my Saturdays letter the Verses in it, I wou'd not have lost for a little Empire no Creature Living has a Coppy of them but y^r self and me, I forgot to tell you in vindication of the unhappy Author Her Lovers never saw them or knew she ever writ a Verse. I believe she was not singular in writing things to sooth Her lonely sorrows that never was Intended to be seen, but 'tis an Inexpressible delight to me when ever I can give you the least proof of an affection that wou'd gladly repose Love Life and Worlds in my friends Gen'rous mind if all depended only on Her fidelity This Cannot proceed from not being certain how few are to be trusted The World soon teaches that hard Lesson, but your Soul is no more an Inhabitant of it, then 'twill be of the Grave, and 'tis my Notion a Spiritual Essence cannot be Confined there. am I too partial, to any thing you write. I find without discord there cannot be perfect Harmony for in that opinion of yours I descent

²³ Apparently a servant; see the next letter.

²⁴ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII, 152.

[dissent?], and venture to deny what you seem to affirm, I own I read them with an Innate Satisfaction, more then I cou'd feel if I did not Love you, but that all your Sentiments are Charming and express'd in the most beautiful terms, I must have seen, tho: the Author had been unknown. You neither want the Sublime or the Correct (I think) in any of your Verses, I am sure they raise the Mind delight and sooth, Just as you design, but how charmingly does Friendship in your lines appear,²⁵ and who can read unmov'd those address'd to the unhappy friend sent me in your last. I was hindered from writing this morning by an unlucky accident And now the Horrid bell tingles the cruel sound, hast to throw by y^r hearts Engine, happy as it makes you Time must be obey'd. I have sent you some Verses upon an Old Roman Encampment near Dorchester now call'd Pomery. you may show them to any Intimate friend, you see they are all my own, but there are two or three Lines that make discoveries about my Ryming which I shou'd be glad if you cou'd Skip in y^r reading of them. They are six or seven years old, I have not time to copy them, and shall be glad if you will be so good to bring them to Town I will copy and return them or give you the Copy which you please. My Heart rejoyces that your Servant is like to do well I know 'twill save you some anxious Minutes. My Pappa who has waited Supper for me this hour as a reward desires to be set down as one of y^r most obedient humble servants. I can almost recon the minutes that of [off?] Happy Tuesday sure the day that brings you to Town will be a very white one at least for me

Hast my Cleora to my wishes bring
 The Joys of friendship and the Charms of spring
 Winter for me will many Beautys wear
 'Tis the blest season that must Call you Here
 Nor Peaceful plains nor groves shall I desire
 but find true pleasure by our cheerful fire
 No more my Thoughts to Rural pleasures bend
 but whilst they fly to meet my Charming friend.

I live in hopes of another letter am every moment most tenderly and Dutifully yours²⁶

²⁵ Lady Hertford composed "Verses to a friend" which may be the ones Miss Cole mentions (Alnwick MS, No. 115, fols. 74-75). Mrs. Rowe praises them in a letter of about this date (*Miscellaneous works*, II, 186).

²⁶ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII, 159-60.

[Miss Grace Cole to Lady Hertford]

[London] October 16

This afternoon Lady Pomfret and Lady Anne Lomley came to see Miss Vane soon after came in Lady P started a discourse of the Moral and Entertaining letters²⁷ she exp[ressed] a Curiosity to see them as having been told you writ some [of] the last ten in the book, I said they were extreemly pretty but I did not think you writ them, she answer'd Mrs. Vernon was the Author, and that you own'd them, I still insisted upon it that I was certain, they were not yours, for you had done me the honor to write me many letters, said what I really thought of those letters, and upon the whole that all your private letters had a thousand beautys which those (pretty as they were) wanted, she seem'd at last convinced you did not write them. I own I was stealing applause from my friend for who ever reads them must admire the author but from what you said to me I was convinced you chose to oblige the World, without the Clogg of thanks and general Speeches, nor did I ever so much as a hint not even to Miss Vane or any Living Mortal that you writ or knew who did write any of them. . . .²⁸

[Verses composed by Lady Hertford]

To M^{rs}. R[owe] who had commended something of my writing.

Publick aplause is what I never sought
 The Worlds opinion nere engag'd my thought
 My Muse with me in silent shades retir'd
 No Critick dreaded nor no fame desir'd . . .
 Some verses at my lesiure Hours I've writ
 To speak my soul, nor aim'd at turns of Wit
 But carelessly to chace the Hours along
 Musing, I dictated my artless song . . .
 And while the Beauteous Prospect I admir'd
 The charming scene my Pensive muse inspir'd.²⁹

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

²⁷ A volume by Elizabeth Rowe published in 1729 (Part I). In this a series of *Letters to Cleora*, composed by Mrs. Rowe, was accompanied by a series *From Cleora to the author*, secretly contributed by Lady Hertford.

²⁸ *Percy family letters and papers*, XXII, 161.

²⁹ Alnwick MS. No. 116, fol. 112; this volume is Lady Hertford's "Miscellany" in which she inscribed compositions of her own and of her friends.

ROTROUS VENCESLAS UND KLEISTS
PRINZ VON HOMBURG

HANS M. WOLFF

DIE Untersuchung der Quellen des *Prinzen von Homburg* hat sich bisher in der Hauptsache auf den Versuch beschränkt, Kleists Vorbilder für den von ihm dargestellten historischen Sachverhalt des Dramas ausfindig zu machen. Wie die ausführliche Arbeit Otto Pniowers zeigt, ist der Dichter dabei nicht einem einzigen literarischen Werk gefolgt, sondern hat deren mehrere verwendet.¹ Dass neben den literarischen Quellen auch einige Erzeugnisse der Malkunst den Dichter angeregt haben, ist sicher. Diese Quellen sind aus dem Grunde besonders wichtig, weil sie die grossen Abweichungen der Kleistschen Schilderung der Ereignisse bei Fehrbellin von den historischen Tatsachen erklären: die Sage hatte sich dieser Vorgänge, die über Sein und Nichtsein der Mark Brandenburg entschieden, angenommen, die Sage wurde für Wahrheit gehalten und selbst Gewährsmänner wie Friedrich II. nahmen sie in ihre Schriften auf.² Aus den nur in geringfügigen Punkten voneinander abweichenden Legenden ergibt sich die Grundlage für die Geschehnisse, die den Hintergrund von Kleists Drama bilden: der Prinz, angeblich ein junger, schöner, unverheirateter Reiterführer, greift die Schweden gegen die Order des Kurfürsten an und macht sich dadurch des militärischen Ungehorsams schuldig. Da aber schliesslich der Sieg errungen wird, kommt es zu dem berühmten Auftritt auf dem Schlachtfeld, in dem der Kurfürst dem ungehorsamen Offizier vergibt, da der Fürst "den Glanz dieses Glückstages nicht mit dem Blute eines Prinzen beflecken will, der eins der vornehmsten Instrumente seines Sieges gewesen ist."³

So wertvoll diese Quellen an sich sind, so dürfen wir nicht vergessen, dass sie im Grunde nichts als die äusseren Voraussetzungen des Dra-

¹ Vgl. Otto Pniower, *Dichtungen und Dichter* (Berlin, 1912), S. 215 ff. Der dort abgedruckte Aufsatz "Prinz Friedrich von Homburg" stellt den Neudruck einer im Jahre 1904 in der *Brandenburgia* (Band XII) veröffentlichten Arbeit dar.

² *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la maison de Brandebourg* (Berlin, 1751). Die entsprechende Stelle ist im Wortlaut wiedergegeben bei Meyer Benfey, *Das Drama Heinrich von Kleists*, II (Berlin, 1913), 579.

³ Friedrich II. in dem oben genannten Werk. Zitiert nach Erich Schmidts Uebersetzung in der Einleitung zum *Prinzen von Homburg*; vgl. seine Ausgabe von Kleists *Werken*, III, 9.

mas bedeuten, jedoch mit dessen eigentlichem Problem überhaupt nichts zu tun haben. Dies liegt ja gerade in der Tatsache, dass der Kurfürst dem Prinzen nicht gleich auf dem Schlachtfeld vergibt, sondern zuerst sehr ernstlich gesonnen ist oder zum mindesten gesonnen zu sein scheint, den Ungehorsam seines Offiziers mit der vollen Strenge des Gesetzes zu treffen, und erst nach schweren Krisen die Begnadigung gewährt. Von diesem Vorgang wissen aber die angegebenen Quellen nichts zu berichten, im Gegenteil, ihr Hauptgewicht liegt auf dem mehr patriotisch erbaulichen als ethisch wertvollen Vorgang der sofortigen Vergebung. Nun ist schon sehr früh die Frage aufgeworfen worden, ob nicht auch das wahre Problem des *Prinzen von Homburg* quellenmässig zu belegen sei. Johannes Niejahr war der erste und, soweit mir bekannt, praktisch auch der einzige, der eine positive Antwort auf diese Frage zu geben wusste, indem er auf eine Erzählung des Livius hinwies.⁴ Der *magister equitum* Q. Fabius hat sich entgegen der ausdrücklichen Order des Diktators Papirius in eine Schlacht eingelassen und dabei einen grossartigen Sieg erfochten. Der Diktator sieht aber darin nur ein Zeichen militärischen Ungehorsams und will den Sieger hinrichten. Selbst Rom und der Senat können ihn in seinem Entschluss nicht umstimmen. Fabius, der zuerst trotzig auf seinen Sieg gepocht hat, wirft sich schliesslich mit seinem Vater dem Diktator gnadeflehend zu Füssen, und dieser gibt daraufhin nach, da er schliesslich das Gesetz anerkannt sieht. Erich Schmidt hat diese Quelle durch Aufnahme in seine Einleitung zum *Prinzen von Homburg* sanktioniert und die Bedenken, ob Kleist diese Stelle mit einiger Wahrscheinlichkeit gekannt hat, mit der Bemerkung aus dem Wege geräumt, dass Livius "dem Dichter der Hermannsschlacht wohlvertraut" gewesen sei.⁵

Es wäre an dieser Stelle überflüssig, zu dieser Auffassung Stellung zu nehmen, da selbst Kleists Kenntnis der Liviusstelle nichts gegen die folgenden Ausführungen beweisen würde. Ich möchte mich hier darauf beschränken, auf ein anderes Werk hinzuweisen, das möglicherweise auf die Abfassung des *Prinzen von Homburg* von Einfluss

⁴ *Euphorion*, IV, 61 ff. Zum Zwecke des Vergleichs (nicht als Quelle!) hatte schon Friedrich Sellar (*Programm des Gymnasiums zu Eisenberg* 1890) die *imperia Manliana* des Livius angeführt. Die Frage, ob hier vielleicht auch gewisse Schillersche Einflüsse vorliegen, lässt sich im Rahmen dieser Arbeit nicht behandeln.

⁵ Kleist, *Werke*, III, 10.

gewesen ist. Es handelt sich um eine Tragödie von Rotrou, *Venceslas*,⁶ die ihrerseits wieder auf eine spanische Tragödie von Francisco de Rojas, *No hay ser padre siendo rey*, zurückgeht. Auf den ersten Blick erscheint die Aehnlichkeit zwischen Rotrous Drama und dem *Prinzen von Homburg* nicht sehr gross. Der *Venceslas* ist die übliche klassizistische Liebes- und Eifersuchtstragödie, die heute nicht nur im Ausland, sondern auch in Frankreich vollkommen in Vergessenheit geraten ist. Die schwerfällige Handlung, deren Wiedergabe auf die hier am meisten interessierenden Punkte beschränkt werden kann, verläuft folgendermassen: Ladislav, Sohn des polnischen Königs Venceslas, ist in Cassandre, die Fürstin von Königsberg, verliebt, die diese Liebe jedoch nicht erwidert. In seiner Eifersucht tötet der Prinz den Liebhaber der Cassandre, ohne zu wissen, dass dies sein eigener Bruder ist. Der König Venceslas verurteilt seinen Sohn darauf zum Tode. Erst nach langen Versuchen, den König zur Gnade zu bewegen, löst dieser das Problem schliesslich in der Weise, dass er seinen Sohn zum König macht und ihn dadurch über das Gesetz stellt. Mit der Aussicht auf eine Heirat des neuen Königs mit Cassandre schliesst das Stück, dessen nähere Betrachtung zeigen soll, wie weit in ihm Parallelen zur Handlung des *Prinzen von Homburg* zu finden sind.

Wenden wir uns zunächst der Verhaftungsszene zu.⁷ Ihre Struktur ist in beiden Dramen ähnlich. Der König erfährt erst in dieser Szene von dem Verbrechen und spricht ohne Zögern das Todesurteil aus.

De ma part donnez avis au prince
Que sa tête, autrefois si chère à la province,
Doit servir aujourd'hui d'un exemple fameux
Qui fera détester son crime à nos neveux [1475-78]

sagt Venceslas und fügt anschliessend hinzu: "Ce coup n'est pas un crime à protéger: J'aurai soin de punir ..." (1485-86). Dass es ihm mit dem Todesurteil ernst ist, zeigt ein kurzer, 4-zeiliger Monolog am Ende der Szene:

O Ciel! ta providence, apparemment prospère,
Au gré de mes soupirs de deux fils m'a fait père,
Et l'un d'eux, qui par l'autre aujourd'hui m'est ôté,
M'oblige à perdre encore celui qui m'est resté! [1487-90].

⁶ Nach Henry Lancaster, *History of French dramatic literature in the 17th century*, II, Part II, 545, ist das Stück zuerst im Jahre 1647 aufgeführt worden. Buchausgabe: Paris, 1648.

⁷ *Prinz von Homburg*, II, 9; *Venceslas*, IV, 5. Die Darstellung der Mordtat des Prinzen nimmt in dem französischen Drama die ersten drei Akte ein, sodass die Parallelität mit Kleists Drama erst im 4. Akt einsetzt.

Die Worte des Kurfürsten in II,10, insbesondere sein "Der ist des Todes schuldig, das erklär' ich . . ." (720) beweisen, dass seine Haltung mit der des Venceslas völlig übereinstimmt, die Anordnungen der beiden Fürsten entsprechen sich genau, im Grunde genommen sogar zu genau, denn da der Kurfürst in der nächsten Zeile hinzufügt, dass er den Täter vor ein Kriegsgericht bestelle, so hat er noch gar kein Recht, dem Gerichte vorzugreifen, während Venceslas von sich aus verurteilen kann, ohne dass es hierbei des Spruches eines Gerichtes bedarf.⁸ Nur eine zufällige Übereinstimmung, die nicht viel besagt, darf wohl in der Tatsache gesehen werden, dass die Verhaftungsbefehle der beiden Monarchen sehr ähnlich sind, des Kurfürsten Befehl: "Nehmt ihm den Degen ab!" (750) findet sich in den Worten des Venceslas "... donnez-moi votre épée" (1468) wieder. Weit wichtiger aber ist es, dass die Haltung der beiden Prinzen starke Ähnlichkeiten aufweist. Entsetzt ruft Ladislas auf den Verhaftungsbefehl hin aus:

Mon épée! Ah! mon crime est-il énorme au point
De me ... [1469-70]

und geht schliesslich, als er einsieht, dass es der König ernst meint, mit einem zornigen Fluch über sein Schicksal ab: "... presse la fin où tu m'a destiné!" In derselben Richtung, nur etwas kräftiger, äussert sich der erste Unwille Homburgs, sein "Helft, Freunde, helft! Ich bin verrückt" (772) ist natürlich mit dem Tone des klassischen Dramas unvereinbar und auch in der deutschen Literatur nur bei Kleist vorstellbar. Ebenso findet auch das Entsetzen derer, die dieser Szene beiwohnen, bei Rotrou einen milderen Ausdruck als bei dem deutschen Dichter, obwohl die Umstehenden mit einer einzigen Ausnahme das Todesurteil missbilligen. Nur einer der Beamten des Königs rafft sich zu einem Ausruf, "O disgrâce inhumaine!" (1471) auf, während die anderen nur stumm und voller Bestürzung herumstehen. Bei Kleist möchten zwar mehrere etwas zugunsten des Prinzen hervorbringen, jedoch kommt keiner der Anwesenden über den Anfang eines Satzes hinaus, sie sind von dem Geschehenen zu überwältigt, um schon ernstliche Versuche zur Begnadigung des Prinzen zu machen.

Unmittelbar nach der Verhaftung setzen diese jedoch sogleich mit voller Stärke ein, wobei die Handlung bei Rotrou sehr viel schneller

⁸ Auf diese Inkorrektheit verweist auch Niejahr in dem angeführten Aufsatz, indem er sie aus dem Livianischen Motiv heraus erklärt (cf. S. 65).

abrollt als bei Kleist. Schon in der folgenden Szene (V, 1) finden wir Théodore, die Schwester des Ladislas, am Werke und durch sie angespornt ihren Liebhaber Frédéric, der eine Art Mittelstellung zwischen Vertrautem und Minister des Königs einnimmt. Frédéric verspricht, seinen Einfluss beim König für die Begnadigung einzusetzen, hält dies aber nicht für nötig, als er in der folgenden Szene dem König begegnet, da dieser den Prinzen sprechen will:

Il sera superflu de tenter mon crédit:

Le sang fait son office, et le roi s'attendrit [1569-70]

sagt Frédéric, hat sich dabei aber vollständig in dem König getäuscht, denn dieser will nur von seinem Sohn vor dessen Hinrichtung Abschied nehmen, nicht aber ihm vergeben. Zwar leidet der König unter diesem Entschluss furchtbar, denn, sagt er, "je sens que je suis père et n'ai pas dépouillé tout humain sentiment" (1580-81), fühlt sich aber zu der Hinrichtung aus Gründen der Gerechtigkeit verpflichtet: "A ma justice (des Königs) en vain ta tendresse (des Vaters) est contraire" (1575). Der Konflikt, der bei Kleist zwischen dem Kurfürsten einerseits und den Freunden des Prinzen andererseits ausgetragen wird, liegt hier zum Teil in dem König selber, der in Monologen seinem zerrissenen Herzen Luft macht. Kleists Kurfürst ist natürlich in demselben Konflikt zwischen der dem Gesetz folgenden Vernunft und seinem Gefühl befangen, ist doch sein Herz, wie er selbst sagt, in der Mitte der Fürsprecher (1442), doch unterdrückt er ihn und erscheint nur als der Vertreter des Gesetzes.

Im folgenden Auftritt (V, 4) erscheint Ladislas wieder auf der Bühne und steht seinem Vater und König gegenüber. Auch er ist im wesentlichen überzeugt, dass er begnadigt werden wird und kann in seiner Bestrafung nichts als einen Akt der Rache sehen.⁹ Darauf kommt die grosse Erklärung des Königs, in der er den Prinzen endgültig von seiner Hinrichtung in Kenntnis setzt. Zwar fühlt sich der König "plus condamné" (1601) als sein Sohn, aber "... à l'Etat je dois ce grand exemple" (1604), denn

... ou l'art de régner n'est plus une vertu,
Et c'est une chimère aux rois que la justice,
Ou, régissant, à l'Etat je dois ce sacrifice [1609-11].

⁹ Vgl. sein "conserver ou venger votre race" in Vers 1583.

Gerade diese Verse sind für das hier behandelte Problem von grösster Bedeutung, denn sie enthalten das Bekenntnis zum strengsten Legalitätsprinzip, und zwar in ganz derselben Form, wie es der Kurfürst in Kleists Drama bis zur vorvorletzten Szene des 5. Aktes vertritt. Ein Regierungssystem, das auf dem Prinzip der Gerechtigkeit aufgebaut ist, erfordert den Tod des Mörders, daran ist nichts zu ändern nach Auffassung des Königs: "Je ne puis rien pour lui, le sang cède à la loi" (1654). Die Pflichten des Königs stehen an erster Stelle, alles andere geht ihnen nach, und auch das Gefühl des Vaters hat sich ihnen unterzuordnen. "Pour conserver mon sceptre, il faut perdre mon fils" (1650), sagt Venceslas, in anderen Worten, auch er hält das Gesetz für "die Mutter seiner Krone" (*Homburg*, 1568), auch er fühlt rechtsstaatlich und baut seine Regierung auf allgemeine Grundsätze, eben die Gesetze, auf und entscheidet nicht willkürlich von Fall zu Fall. Er teilt also mit dem Kurfürsten die Auffassung, die letzterer Natalien gegenüber ausspricht:

Wär' ich ein Tyrann,
Dein Wort, das fühl' ich lebhaft, hätte mir
Das Herz schon in der erzen Brust geschmelzt.
Dich aber frag ich selbst: darf ich den Spruch,
Den das Gericht gefällt, wohl unterdrücken? [1112-16]

Auch Venceslas "will, dass dem Gesetz Gehorsam sei" (734), und so ist er genausowenig wie der Kurfürst in der Lage, eine Ausnahme vom Gesetz zu bewilligen, obwohl er sich selber darüber klar ist, dass er eine "justice inhumaine" (1649) ausübt. Daher ist wohl seine Frage an Ladislás: "Enfin, d'un grand effort vous trouvez-vous capable?" (1595) mehr rhetorisch gemeint, immerhin erinnert der Gedanke, den Vollzug des Todesurteils bis zu einem gewissen Grade von dem Verurteilten selbst abhängig zu machen, stark an den Brief des Kurfürsten an Homburg, auf den der erstere ja ebenfalls eine Zustimmung erwartet und erhält.

Ladislás reagiert auf das Todesurteil anders als Homburg, die Todesfurchtsszene finden wir nicht, auch sie ist etwas, was nur ein Dichter wie Kleist in ein Drama dieses Stils einweben konnte. Das klassische Drama kennt selbstverständlich solche Ausbrüche nicht.¹⁰

¹⁰ Eigenartigerweise ist die Haltung des Prinzen in Rojas Drama sehr viel weniger stoisch als bei Rotrou, der wohl mit Rücksicht auf die klassizistische Theorie des Drama⁹ allzu heftige Erregungen nach Möglichkeit abdämpfte.

Ladislas gibt seine Einwilligung doch fühlt er sich noch immer als das Opfer einer persönlichen Rache, ist sich also noch immer nicht vollständig darüber im klaren, dass sein Tod ein unbedingtes Gebot der Gerechtigkeit ist. Daraus erklärt sich sein Ausruf am Schluss dieser Szene:

... O vertu trop sévère!

Venceslas vit encor, et je n'ai plus de père! [1647-48],

unter dem er zum Schaffot abgeführt wird.

Unmittelbar nach diesem Auftritt kommen Théodore und Cassandre, des Ladislas Schwester und seines ermordeten Bruders Geliebte, herein und werfen sich beide dem König mit der Bitte um Begnadigung des Prinzen zu Füßen. Die Frauen argumentieren dabei auf einer ganz ähnlichen Grundlage, wie es Natalie in IV, 1 dem Kurfürsten gegenüber tut.

Par quelle loi, Seigneur, si barbare et si dure

Pouvez-vous renverser celle de la nature? [1659-60]

fragt Théodore, gerade so wie Natalie sagt, dass die Zerreißung des Spruches der Richter ihr als die schönste Ordnung, und das ist ja die vernünftige-natürliche Ordnung, erscheint.¹¹ Und dann fährt Natalie fort:

Das Kriegsgesetz, das weiss ich wohl, soll herrschen

Jedoch die lieblichen Gefühle auch [1129-30],

und ebenso sagt Théodore: "La pitié," die sicherlich das wichtigste von den von Natalie genannten "lieblichen Gefühlen" ist, "qui fera révoquer son supplice, N'est pas moins la vertu d'un roi que la justice" (1671-72). Also auch das Gefühl, insbesondere das Mitleid darf von dem Monarchen nicht vergessen werden; die abstrakte Anwendung starrer Regeln allein macht nach Théodore wie nach Natalie die Kunst des Regierens nicht aus. Und noch ein anderes Geschütz führt Théodore in dieser Besprechung mit dem König auf. Die Begnadigung ist ein Gebot der Menschlichkeit, aber ausserdem ist die Erhaltung des allgemein beliebten Prinzen und Thronerben auch aus Gründen des "intérêt de l'Etat" erforderlich (1680). Nicht nur, wie Natalie, stellt Théodore also das Prinzip der Humanität dem von den beiden Monarchen vertretenen Legalitätsprinzip gegenüber, sondern verweist auch schon auf den absoluten Gegensatz des letzteren, das

¹¹ Vers 1125 bis 1128.

Opportunitätsprinzip. Dieses wird dann in voller Schärfe von Frédéric ausgeführt:

Le seul sang de l'infant par son crime est versé,
Mais par son châtement tout l'Etat est blessé:
Sa cause, quoique injuste, est la cause publique:
Il n'est pas toujours bon d'être trop politique.
Ce que veut tout l'Etat se peut-il denier? [1641-45]

Der Gedanke der Staatsraison erfordert hier eine Abweichung vom Gesetz und ähnlich wie Kottwitz könnte auch Frédéric seinem König die Worte entgegenhalten:

Herr, das Gesetz, das höchste, oberste,
Das wirken soll in deiner Feldherrn Brust,
Das ist der Buchstab deines Willens nicht;
Das ist das Vaterland, das ist die Krone,
Das bist Du selber, dessen Haupt sie trägt [1570-74].¹²

Die Gerechtigkeit, das ist offenbar Kleists wie Rotrou's Gedanke, ist vom Standpunkt des Staates aus kein absoluter Selbstzweck, höher als sie steht das einzige irdische Element, das sie garantieren kann, der Staat selber, und wenn die Gerechtigkeit den Staat in schwere Gefahren zu stürzen droht, dann muss der Staat diese Gerechtigkeit unter Umständen für bestimmte Fälle ausser Kraft setzen und auf seinen rechtmässigen Strafanspruch verzichten. Das bis zum Extrem durchgeführte Legalitätsprinzip ist unhaltbar, da es sich in gewissen Fällen gegen seinen eigenen Träger, den Staat, kehren kann.

Diese Möglichkeit wird sowohl bei Kleist wie bei Rotrou aufs deutlichste durch Tatsachen demonstriert, wobei diesmal der französische Dichter stärkere Farben aufträgt als der deutsche. Ladislas ist, wie schon in den vorhergehenden Szenen kurz angedeutet worden ist, beim Volke ausserordentlich beliebt. Diese Liebe ist bei den Anstalten zur Vorbereitung der Hinrichtung des Prinzen zu einem explosiven Ausdruck gekommen:

Seigneur, d'un cri commun toute la populace
Parle en faveur du prince et demande sa grâce,
Et surtout un grand nombre, en la place amassé,
A d'un zèle indiscret l'échafaud renversé ... [1747-50],

¹² In diesen Worten kommt nicht solch ein reines Opportunitätsprinzip zum Ausdruck, wie in den Worten Frédéric's. Kleists Ideen sind hier schon stark von Adam Müller beeinflusst, dessen Staatsidee sich in den angeführten Versen deutlich widerspiegelt. Auf diesen Einfluss ist Abweichung zwischen den Worten Frédéric's und Kottwitz's im wesentlichen zurückzuführen.

ja, das erregte Volk schreitet sogar zum offenen Aufruhr, und der Gouverneur von Warschau gesteht offen ein, dass er nicht weiss, wie er dieser Revolution Herr werden soll, wenn diese Erregung nicht bald abgekühlt wird. Ganz ähnlich kommt es auch im preussischen Staate zu "zweideutigen Vorfällen," die wohl nicht nur den Dey von Tunis, sondern auch manchen anderen Fürsten dazu veranlassen würden, Lärm zu schlagen, und der Feldmarschall Dörfling stürzt ernstlich beunruhigt in das Zimmer des Monarchen mit dem Ausruf: "Rebellion!" (1428). Nur infolge der überlegenen Menschenkenntnis des Kurfürsten kommt es zu keinem ersten Konflikt des Fürsten mit seinem Heere, aber dass der Kurfürst durch die Vollstreckung des Todesurteils zumindestens die Liebe seines gesamten Heeres einbüßen würde, das wird auch hier klar.¹³

Die Unmenschlichkeit der Hinrichtung wird in beiden Dramen durch den Gedanken der Läuterung in ein besonders helles Licht gesetzt: die beiden Prinzen beweisen am Schluss ihren Wert und damit ihr Lebensrecht durch einen grossartigen moralischen Aufschwung. Homburg rafft sich aus seiner Todesfurcht zu einer gefassten Resignation auf und ringt sich schliesslich zur Anerkennung der Berechtigung des ergangenen Todesurteils durch. Auch Ladislas trägt, wie wir aus dem Munde Frédéric's erfahren, ein wahrhaft heroisches Verhalten zur Schau, er scheint sich eher auf eine Hochzeit als auf eine Hinrichtung vorzubereiten und ist, genauso wie Homburg, nunmehr wirklich ein Prinz geworden, wie der Berichterstatter ausdrücklich hervorhebt,¹⁴ nachdem er uns vorher stets nur als ein allen eignen Trieben gegenüber widerstandsloser Egoist geschildert worden ist. Erst nachdem ihn der König auf die Nachricht von der Empörung des Volkes hin vom Schaffot hat zurückrufen lassen, finden wir ihn von der Rechtmässigkeit seiner Hinrichtung innerlich überzeugt, erst jetzt ruft er dem Vater zu, den Sohn aufzugeben und das Urteil zu vollstrecken, sodass er dieselbe Wandlung durchgemacht hat wie Homburg.

Soweit geht die Parallelität der beiden Dramen, aber hier hört sie auf. Das Ende entspringt aus völlig verschiedenen politischen Weltanschauungen. Rotrou, dessen Schaffensperiode in die Zeit der

¹³ Vgl. insbesondere die Worte von Kottwitz in Vers 1811 und die Bühnenanmerkung: "kalt."

¹⁴ Vgl. Verse 1723-24: "C'est en ce moment, qu'il est prince en effet et qu'il peut se le dire."

Regierung Richelieus und Mazarins fällt, fand die Lösung des angeschlagenen Problems aus dem Gedanken, dass der König über dem Gesetz steht und Ladislas seiner Strafe somit ledig ist, sobald der alte König zu Gunsten seines Sohnes abdankt. Für unseren modernen Geschmack liegt darin eine etwas unaufrichtige Wahrung des Legalitätsprinzips, unaufrichtig, da auch der Monarch für uns heute nur der erste Diener seines Staates ist und somit nicht über dem Recht steht. Kleist dagegen, vom Geiste Adam Müllers beseelt, konnte hier ohne alle Schliche die Begnadigung zulassen, indem er das Legalitätsprinzip aufgibt und alle Gegensätze in Müllers Synthese von Legalität und Opportunität, dem feudalistischen Staate, auflöst.

Am Ende des Dramas klappt also die grosse weltanschauliche Differenz zwischen den beiden Dichtern auf, im übrigen ist aber die Führung der Intrigue ausserordentlich ähnlich. Das zeigt sich noch besonders darin, dass in der klassischen Tragödie auch der Keim zu dem Liebesmotiv des *Prinzen von Homburg* schon bis zu einem gewissen Grade enthalten ist. In Wirklichkeit war der Prinz von Homburg zur Zeit der Schlacht von Fehrbellin schon längst in zweiter Ehe mit einer Nichte des Grossen Kurfürsten verheiratet, sodass die Gestalt der Natalie sowie die Liebe zwischen ihr und dem Prinzen ein freier Zusatz des Dichters zu den Legenden, die sich um die Gestalt des Siegers von Fehrbellin rankten, ist. In dem französischen Drama dagegen wird das Verbrechen aus Liebe begangen, aber obwohl Cassandre zuerst die Bestrafung des Mörders ihres Geliebten verlangt, finden wir sie bald mit Théodore, um Gnade bittend, zu Füßen des Königs, wobei sie ausdrücklich ihrer Rache entsagt, und das Stück schliesst sogar mit der Aussicht auf eine baldige Heirat von Ladislas und Cassandre. Es ist sehr wohl möglich, dass gerade dieses Vorbild Kleist dazu veranlasste, das Liebesmotiv in sein Drama aufzunehmen.

Nimmt man also den historischen Stoff, wie Kleist ihn vorfand, d.h. den Fehltritt des Prinzen und seine bedingungslose Begnadigung auf dem Schlachtfeld, und schiebt man zwischen diese beiden Punkte die Intrigue des Rotrouschen Dramas ein, so steht Kleists Drama in seinen Grundzügen da. Das einzige Problem, das gewisse Bedenken hervorrufen könnte, ist die Frage, ob Homburgs Fehltritt, "blond mit blauen Augen" (1095), und der düstere Mord des Ladislas auf gleicher Ebene stehen. Die Antwort liegt darin, dass auch Homburg bei seinem Vergehen von nichts als reinem Egoismus angetrieben wird. Er über-

tritt die Order des Kurfürsten in dem Moment, als sich der Sieg auf die Seite der Märker geneigt zu haben scheint, also nur, um von dem allgemeinen Ruhm seinen Teil abzubekommen und daraufhin Natalie zu erlangen. Homburg ist also sowohl subjektiv wie objektiv ein Verbrecher,¹⁵ und nur, weil er durch seinen Fehltritt kein Unheil anrichtet, fühlen wir für ihn tiefste Sympathie und stehen mit vollem Herzen auf Seiten derer, die für seine Begnadigung wirken. Können wir genau so für Ladislas fühlen? Anstatt eine eigene Antwort zu geben, hören wir, was einer von Rotrous besten Kritikern, Marmontel, über diesen Punkt gesagt hat:

Que Ladislas soit fougueux, violent, emporté dans les accès de passion, c'est en cela qu'il est tragique; mais c'est pour lui qu'on doit trembler et s'attendrir; c'est lui qui doit arracher des larmes; c'est à lui qu'on doit s'attacher, c'est lui qu'on doit voir avec frémissement monter sur l'échafaud; c'est lui qu'on doit voir avec joie de l'échafaud passer au trône; et dans le moment que son père, pour le sauver, lui met la couronne sur la tête, tous les cœurs doivent applaudir. Il faut donc que son caractère soit celui d'un prince naturellement bon, mais égaré, rendu furieux et coupable par des passions qu'il n'a pu dompter.¹⁶

Wenn wir den Worten Marmontels, der sich wie keiner gerade mit diesem Drama abgegeben hat, trauen dürfen, so liegen die Fälle des Prinzen von Homburg und des Ladislas völlig gleich: um die Geliebte zu erringen, begehen sie ein Verbrechen, wegen dessen sie zum Tode verurteilt werden, da aber alle Herzen den beiden Prinzen verzeihen und für sie Partei nehmen, werden sie begnadigt und mit der Geliebten vereinigt.

Dass zwischen dem *Venceslas* und dem *Prinzen von Homburg* weitgehende Ähnlichkeiten bestehen, lässt sich nicht leugnen. Bevor aus diesen Ähnlichkeiten aber Folgerungen auf einen eventuellen Einfluss des älteren auf das neuere Drama gezogen werden können, ergibt sich die Frage, ob Kleist das Werk Rotrous gekannt hat. Der *Venceslas* ist heute so gut wie verschollen und ist selbst dem Fachmann mehr als ein Name denn als ein Drama bekannt. Gerade zu Kleists Zeiten war dies aber vollständig anders. Durch die Revolution und das Empire ist das Stück zu grosser Bedeutung gekommen, nachdem

¹⁵ Auf diese Tatsache hat kürzlich wieder John C. Blankenagel im Gegensatz zu andersartigen Ausführungen Meyer-Benfey's hingewiesen. "His (des Prinzen) conduct is clearly disobedience in the face of the enemy . . ." sagt der Verfasser und wird damit dem Sinn wie dem Wortlaut des Dramas gerecht. Vgl. *MLN*, LII (1937), 339 ff.

¹⁶ *Œuvres de Marmontel* (Paris, 1820), VII, 354 ff., insbesondere, pp. 436 ff.

es in den vorhergehenden Jahrzehnten geringere Beachtung gefunden hatte. Ladislav war eine der Glanzrollen Talmas, des grössten Interpreten der französischen Klassizisten, der je gelebt hat; zahlreiche Kritiken erschienen in zeitgenössischen Journalen; die Zahl der Aufführungen stieg erheblich;¹⁷ La Harpe behandelte es in seinen Vorlesungen über antike und moderne Literatur usw.¹⁸ Gesehen hat Kleist das Stück wohl nicht: die Daten der Aufführungen stimmen mit der Zeit seiner Pariser Aufenthalte nicht überein. Im Jahre 1801, in das Kleists längster Aufenthalt in Paris fällt, fand keine Aufführung des *Venceslas* statt, 1803 wurde das Drama zweimal gegeben, aber beide Male im Frühling, während Kleist erst im Oktober nach Paris kam.¹⁹ Trotzdem darf man annehmen, dass ein Drama, das gerade zu jener Zeit erhebliches Aufsehen erregte, Kleist bekannt war. Für den Herausgeber eines Journals für die Kunst (*Phöbus*) versteht sich das fast von selbst, besonders wenn wir bedenken, dass der Dichter von früher Jugend an mit der französischen Sprache und Kultur aufs innigste vertraut war. Dass gerade das Jahr 1807, in dem Kleist als Gefangener in Frankreich weilte, eine besonders grosse Zahl von Aufführungen brachte,²⁰ darunter eine, die in die Zeit seiner Gefangenschaft fällt,²¹ macht Kleists Kenntnis dieses Werkes noch wahrscheinlicher. Selbst wenn wir aber Kleists Kenntnis unterstellen, haben wir nicht das Recht, hier von einer Abhängigkeit zu sprechen, denn die Ähnlichkeiten des französischen und des deutschen Dramas liegen fast ausschliesslich im Stoff, während im Gehalt und in der Form unüberbrückbare Gegensätze bestehen. Es kann sich hier also nur um eine Quelle für den *Prinzen von Homburg* handeln, aber innerhalb dieses Rahmens darf man wohl unbedenklich einen Einfluss der Rotrouschen Tragödie auf das Kleistsche Drama annehmen.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

¹⁷Eine genaue Statistik der Aufführungen gibt A. Joannidès, *Programmes de la Comédie Française*.

¹⁸Einen genauen Ueberblick über die Entwicklungsgeschichte dieses Dramas gibt L. Person, *Histoire du Venceslas de Rotrou* (Paris, 1882).

¹⁹Die genauen Daten der Aufführungen des *Venceslas* sind mir in liebenswürdigster Weise von Herrn Edouard Bourdet, Administrateur Général de la Comédie Française, mitgeteilt worden, dem ich hiermit meinen Dank abstatte möchte.

²⁰Joannidès listet 7, doch liegt hier offenbar ein Irrtum vor, da sich sowohl aus einem Brief von Herrn Bourdet, wie auch aus dem oben genannten Werk von Person nur eine Zahl von 6 Aufführungen ergibt.

²¹Die Aufführung vom 15. Mai 1807.

BOOK REVIEWS

Jean le Clerc (1657-1736) et la république des lettres. By ANNIE BARNES.
Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1938. Pp. 281.

In his own day Jean le Clerc was a prominent and an important figure in the international republic of letters. Born in Geneva of French parentage, he traveled in France, Holland, and England, eventually settling in Amsterdam, where he achieved a truly international reputation by his editing of a series of successful journals, by his pioneer labors in Biblical scholarship, and by his contacts with the most eminent savants of Europe. To him is due the introduction of Locke to the Continent, and if Le Clerc rarely appears in the histories of English or French literature, he is actually more important than Bayle in furthering knowledge of English thought in eighteenth-century France. In the present interesting and well-documented study Mrs. Barnes traces in patient detail the varied and tempestuous career of Le Clerc in the intellectual and religious milieu which served as background for his extraordinary literary output.

Seventeenth-century Geneva, with its "caractère de ville sainte, de forteresse de la vérité, et d'asile de tous les persécutés pour la foi," was the scene of Le Clerc's youth; here he came into contact with such figures as Robert Chouet, Philippe Mestrezat, and especially Louis Tronchin, whom Bayle characterized as "le plus pénétrant et le plus judicieux théologien de notre Communion." In the five years of travel and study which followed—in the Protestant Academy of Saumur, in the Remonstrant College of Amsterdam, and in the Huguenot community at London—Le Clerc developed the spirit of free inquiry and hatred of religious intolerance which were to characterize the whole of his scholarly work. From 1683-84 until the close of his long life a half-century later, Le Clerc lived in Amsterdam, where he devoted himself to teaching and writing. Here he edited the *Bibliothèque universelle et historique*, the *Bibliothèque choisie*, and the *Bibliothèque ancienne et moderne*; and here he poured out an increasing flood of works in the fields of theology, philosophy, literary criticism, history, and classical philology.

Mrs. Barnes has not attempted to analyze and judge these voluminous works in Latin and French: such a task, she sensibly remarks, would require "toute l'érudition d'un Le Clerc augmentée de toutes les acquisitions de la science moderne." It is rather as a representative of that cosmopolitan period of transition between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that Le Clerc appears in the pages of her book, and to the student of comparative literature

the most valuable chapters will consequently be the three (v, vi, and vii) devoted to the English, French, Swiss, German, and Italian friendships—and quarrels—in which Le Clerc participated. From the correspondence of Le Clerc and the letters written to him (now for the most part in the library of the University of Amsterdam) Mrs. Barnes is able to reconstruct the history of Le Clerc's relations with such Englishmen as Locke, Bishop Burnet, the Earl of Pembroke, Addison, Shaftesbury, and Berkeley, to name only the most important. The roster of correspondents in other countries includes less famous names, perhaps, but touches a wide variety of interests; here the chief personages are Fontenelle, Jean Bouhier, Bernard and François Lamy, Claude Nicaise, Fraguier, Bignon, Le Courayer, Turretinni, Thomasius, Fabricius, and Vico. In an appendix Mrs. Barnes prints six hitherto unpublished letters of Bishop Burnet to Le Clerc, ranging in date from 1690 to 1703. A bibliography of manuscripts and published works of Le Clerc, and an index of proper names, conclude the book. Mrs. Barnes's study includes so much material hitherto accessible only in scattered and incomplete form that her work will be of great value to students of the intellectual history of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Amid this multiplicity of interests, however, we never lose sight of the figure of "Joannes Clericus polyhistor," a figure which emerges with increased stature from the pages of this interesting and scholarly study.¹

DONALD F. BOND

University of Chicago

The clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophic ideas in France from 1700 to 1750. By IRA O. WADE. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. x+329.

In the bright, optimistic eighteenth century a group of men, freed from all prejudices, believed that the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity were "the ideals of the natural law, eternal and immutable principles of nature which reason discovers and applies." They believed that Christianity was the mother of superstition, which gave birth to untruth, corruption and to all

¹ P. 95: on Bishop Wake's project for union of the Anglican and French churches, cf. E. Préclin, *L'Union des églises gallicane et anglicane: une tentative au temps de Louis XV: P. F. le Courayer (de 1681 à 1732) et Guillaume Wake* (Paris, 1928). P. 140: the translation of the *Twelve dissertations* may have been by Tom Brown; cf. Benjamin Boyce, *Tom Brown of facetious memory* (Cambridge [Mass.], 1939), pp. 52-53. P. 153: to the list of English translations of items reprinted from Le Clerc's *Bibliothèques* may be added *Monsieur le Clerc's extract and judgment of the Characteristics* . . . (1712); *An abstract and judgment of Dr. [Samuel] Clarke's polemical or controversial writings* . . . (1713) (both from the *Bibliothèque choisie*); *Remarks upon Mr. Addison's travels* . . . written in French by Monsieur le Clerc, translated by Mr. Theobald (2d ed., 1727). P. 161: Burnet can hardly be classed among the Tories.

manner of iniquity. In the shadow of that religion the soul, heart, and mind of man had been blighted. These could only be brought to life in the baptismal bath of Natural Law. And in the discovery of these truths they were very, very proud.

There emerges from a reading of Professor Wade's book a synthesis of the arguments used in the eighteenth century to overthrow the platonic or the supernatural interpretation of the universe. In the place thereof there was substituted the naturalistic and the rationalistic. For the first time in more than a thousand years the truth was identified so completely with secondary causes, clearly revealing themselves in material forms, that all perspective was lost concerning the destiny of man in any other terms, especially in those that posited a primary cause, whose essence was mind, whose purpose was the redemption of man.

The point of departure of Professor Wade's study was M. Lanson's article in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire* (1912), entitled "Questions diverses sur l'histoire de l'esprit philosophique en France avant 1750," wherein he pointed to the existence of manuscript treatises circulating in France in the first half of the eighteenth century. He suggested that "the ideas in these treatises represent one of the most important sources for the philosophic current from 1750 to 1789." That this is true Professor Wade has shown beyond the slightest doubt. He has made a magnificently detailed and objective study of a hundred-odd manuscript treatises that circulated in France before 1750. His book is a monument to careful, controlled, minute scholarship. It is a veritable encyclopedia of deistic and atheistic thought. As such it gives us exceedingly valuable information concerning the location, date, authorship, ownership, history, contents, popularity, and influence of innumerable radical treatises.

Professor Wade describes the technique of circulating the manuscripts, the efforts of the censorship to prevent their diffusion, the success of the *col-porteurs* in flouting the police. He gives us a list of the treatises that Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot knew, and points to the resemblances in the thought of the latter with the ideas they contain. For the first time anywhere, he uncovers the contents of many works which scholars have to a large extent known only by title, and by that token, he covers the whole range of heterodox thought from the mildly liberal views of Pierre Cuppé's *Le Ciel ouvert à tous*, which preaches universal salvation, through the critical deism of such works as *Le militaire philosophe*, *L'Examen de la religion*, and *La Religion chrétienne analysée*, which attack the validity of the Bible, the divinity of Christ, the dogmas of the Church, and all proofs of the truth of religion that are founded on a belief in the revelation of God, to the undiluted atheism of *Jordanus Brunus redivivus* and the *Dialogues sur l'âme*, which deny free will and the existence of God, positing as first and only cause "la nature éternelle et infinie."

Professor Wade's original contribution in his chapter on Meslier is his

excellent analysis of the apostate priest's materialism and the prominence he gives to the influence of Spinoza in the development thereof. His characterization, however, of Meslier as a man "drunk with God" is, I believe, unsupported by the evidence. Meslier was a thoroughgoing materialist. Nowhere does he manifest any mystical tendencies, pantheistic, stoic, or Christian. He was, it would seem, a complete extrovert, rationalist and positivist, and as such avoided like the plague anything that smacked of the mystical experience. I regret to say, moreover, that Professor Wade has not convinced me that Voltaire did not compose his own *Extrait* of Meslier's *Testament*, and that he merely polished and edited an *Extrait* of some unknown scribe. The question is complicated and the space at my disposal does not permit a discussion. Until all the manuscript *Testaments* and *Extraits* are clearly dated, it will be impossible to solve the problem, for it will always be possible to argue that the interpolations in Voltaire's *Extrait* were for the most part written by him, and that their presence in other manuscripts of the *Extrait* was owing to scribes who took their material from him. I am still inclined to believe that Voltaire made his own *Extrait*, and that he made it perhaps as early as 1742.

Professor Wade gives us many significant details concerning the almost legendary figure of Boulainvilliers (1658-1722), the *grand seigneur*, whose keen mind and wide intellectual interests were devoted primarily to the solving of fundamental problems. He seems to have been the center of a "petite société de libres chercheurs," who gathered at the residence of the Duc de Noailles. The group was composed of Fréret, Mirabaud, Dumarsais, and others. It was apparently very active in the diffusion of radical ideas, and has been called the *Coterie Boulainvilliers*, resembling to all intents and purposes the more celebrated *Coterie Holbachique* that flourished half a century later.

Boulainvilliers was an omnivorous reader on many subjects. He was a philosopher of parts, a radical deist, and a social and political historian. He was the most important influence of his time in the diffusion of spinozistic thought. Most of the works by him or attributed to him have somewhere in their titles the name of Spinoza, and find much of their inspiration in the *Ethics* and the *Tractatus*. The Spinoza he presents, however, is sadly misinterpreted. Boulainvilliers is to a large extent responsible for the bad reputation that Spinoza suffered in the eighteenth century.

Much more could be written concerning Professor Wade's excellent study. Especially noteworthy is his solution of the problem of *Les trois imposteurs*, the importance he assigns to the work of Isaac Orobio, his discovery of a three-volume manuscript, entitled *Examen de la Genèse*, in the handwriting of Mme du Châtelet, and above all, the strong confirmation he gives respecting the importance of Bayle and Spinoza as the well-spring of the philosophic current that flooded the eighteenth century. In the index I hastily put to-

gether in my copy of Mr. Wade's book, there are more than a hundred separate references to Spinoza and to the works he influenced.

A few errors of fact and perhaps of interpretation occur, which I need not enlarge upon. They have been discussed or referred to by previous reviewers, notably by Professors Torrey, Lough, and Green. Whatever be the errors—and it is beyond the knowledge of one man to control all the facts in a field as vast as Professor Wade undertook to explore—his study is an outstanding contribution. He has widened considerably our knowledge of the eighteenth century and has shown us the important role that minor actors played in the revolution of thought that ushered in the modern era.

ANDREW R. MOREHOUSE

Yale University

The spirit of Voltaire. By NORMAN L. TORREY. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. ix+314.

At first sight, there seems to be little novelty and a good deal of disorganization in Professor Torrey's volume. We hear again certain twice-told tales about Voltaire, and the disparate topics, though handled with shrewdness, do not appear to be integrated by a common purpose. Little symmetry or co-ordination is visible in such chapter headings and subheadings as Voltaire's "libertinism," his passion for justice, his "acquisition of personal dignity," his relations with Rousseau, his "protective lying." The long chapter quaintly called "Pride and prejudice" is very scrappy; throughout the work there are minor digressions and irrelevancies, e.g., on gardening or other compensations. Presently we move on to the last chapters, or essays, dealing with Voltaire's final years, his attacks on Pascal, etc. And we close the book upon the searching query as to whether Voltaire was "Deist, mystic, or humanist?"

Had Professor Torrey started with his *finale* and played up from the beginning Voltaire's essential humanity (which is what is really meant by the worn term "humanism"), we should have known where we were. Yet as it stands, a duplex clue to the labyrinth may be discerned in the frequent emphasis either on the portrait or the message of the subject. Taken together, these presumably constitute the "spirit of Voltaire"; and the transmitter insists that the writer's life-course (mainly according to the *Correspondance*) and his philosophy are closely bound together through his essential "humanism."

The portrait is quite recognizable, though at times over-idealized or simplified. (For example, little is made of Voltaire's perversity or of his gift for gratuitous lying.) But it is surely time to attenuate the "hideux sourire" and to expound rather the constructive side of the great liberal. Another of Professor Torrey's chief contentions is that this "rare combination of wit and

humanity" showed an essential oneness in his main drive. He went after hedonism and happiness, but also (especially at Ferney) after the "good life" as a whole, after friendship, after reforms and tolerance and justice above all. As for his humanism, he accepted "man as the measure of all things"—even of God; furthermore, he was often attached to particular men—from whom philanthropists are at times averse; and his "scale of values" (this seems more debatable) was largely "humanistic," rather than by social hierarchies.

The message chimes with this portrait. For, as the "thoughts of men are widened" toward the acceptance of socio-political problems as central in our scheme of things, should we not appreciate more fully the "spirit of Voltaire"? His "conscious choice," says Torrey, was the "subordination of literary beauty"—to which nonetheless he remained singularly responsive—"to political considerations." With regard to literary standards and religious beliefs, it might be possible again to achieve a harmony. Such a solution would be suggested by the interesting view, in Torrey's final chapter, that on Voltaire's classical foundation could well be erected the outposts of his *philosophe* propaganda: the extensible table of the humanities could well include the extra leaf of theism. "The return of religion to . . . basic, universal principles . . . is an essential and consistent manifestation of the French classical ideal." This position is reinforced by arguments which we cannot develop here. Also the author again deviates into bypaths, such as a consideration of Voltaire's "mysticism" and doubts as to the sincerity of the *Profession de foi d'un théiste*, which might have been left untrodden. And the final pages, along with certain discrepancies, contain what amounts to one more apotheosis of Voltaire. On the whole, then, this volume offers a contribution which could have been made more definitely that by unsparing concentration and the elimination of some hazy edges in conception and definition. The bibliographical notes are sufficient for the author's purpose, and there is an ample index.¹

E. PRESTON DARGAN

University of Chicago

¹ A few errors or debatable points: There are *passim* too many cases of the alleged "betrayal" of Voltaire by this, that, or the other person. It is misleading to say (p. 11), in spite of the subsequent extension of the term, that Voltaire "was the greatest and the most complete of the French classicists." Nor will it do to maintain (p. 12), in view of his rejection of Cartesian epistemology, that "on . . . the nature of knowledge and of reality Voltaire's conceptions were definitely classic." The effects of Mme de Tencin's enmity and the extent of Mme du Deffand's friendship seem to be overplayed. Some paradoxicality is involved in the statement (p. 187) that Voltaire "began at sixty-five to live in earnest." Montesquieu was hardly "admitted to the Academy on his reputation for the . . . *Lettres persanes*" (p. 121). It was rather this reputation which for quite a while kept him out.—On the other hand, good presentations are given to the case-history of the Voltaire-Rousseau imbroglio, of Voltaire as "seigneur de village," of the *chiaroscuro* of Voltaire vs. Pascal, and of how the skeptic faced death rather like an ancient sage than like a modern believer.

The polite marriage. By J. M. S. TOMPKINS. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1938. Pp. vii+209.

This book is in large part an outgrowth of Miss Tompkins' admirable study, *The popular novel in England*, and comprises studies of several minor novelists—Elizabeth and Richard Griffith, Mary Hays, James White—and of two versifiers—the Rev. Hugh Downman of Exeter, and Ann Yearsley. All these have their points, except perhaps Downman, who remains rather dull. Miss Tompkins remarks that in the minor writer we can study personal experience and literary fashion as they coexist only slightly altered by reflection and emotion. In practice she inclines to take her individuals by themselves, and writes of their lives and works in a brilliant and at times slightly precious style. She knows her subjects so well that she can read between the lines, and she is very skilful at salvaging good bits for quotation. At the same time she avoids the patronizing air and the ghastly facetiousness which are sometimes considered appropriate for the treatment of eighteenth-century bygoners.

The pedestrian student would have been glad to have a little more about the literary fashions. No scholar is better qualified than Miss Tompkins to consider the delicate question of the reflex action of sentimental modes in literature upon the actual conduct of life. Thus the union of Richard and Elizabeth Griffith is called "the polite marriage" because it is almost out of a book, conducted in terms of "polite correspondence." Elizabeth in the role of "Frances" writes to Richard in the role of "Henry" about the suggestion that he should undertake a novel: "It would be an easier Task for you than almost any Man, for I think your whole Life and Character have a great deal of that Stile in them." The author of a crude bit of autobiography called *The Scotch parents*, one of the oddities studied by Miss Tompkins, is influenced by the fancy world of fiction and drama. Mary Hays is a female Quixote, who reads, writes, and tries to live novels. The career of the unfortunate Ann Yearsley, the milkwoman of Bristol, was largely determined by the conception of the untutored genius, the child of nature. James White, an interesting author to whom Miss Tompkins had already called attention, has an eighteenth-century sense of fact which makes capital burlesque out of his return to the Middle Ages. There is a similar turn to self-parody in sentimentalism.

Miss Tompkins' notes on sources make spade-work attractive and show an expert use of material which is often scattered and unpromising. To the references on Downman might be added Farley's account of his *Death-song of Ragnar Lodbrach* (*Scandinavian influences in the English romantic movement* [Boston, 1903], pp. 70-72). The name of Elizabeth Griffith's unidentified father is said to be in the list of subscribers to *Mona antiqua restaurata*; this book, not traced by Miss Tompkins, was written by Henry Rowlands (Dublin, 1723), and among the subscribers are nine Griffiths to challenge genealogical research.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP

Rice Institute

Matthew Arnold. By LIONEL TRILLING. New York: W. W. Norton, 1939. Pp. xiv+465.

Matthew Arnold. By CARLETON STANLEY. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1938. Pp. 163.

Both of these books make an effort, in quite different ways, and in unequal degrees, to demonstrate the organic unity behind the multifold activity of Matthew Arnold. It is to be regretted that Mr. Trilling's book has appeared before the forthcoming publication of the new edition of Arnold's notebooks by Professors Howard F. Lowry, Karl Young, and Waldo H. Dunn, and before the publication of an annotated edition of Arnold's poems which Professor Lowry is preparing with Professor Chauncey Brewster Tinker. Mr. Trilling's pages on the Marguerite episode, for example, suffer from a lack of more than the conventional knowledge on it; and, in spite of the rich and stimulating analysis of Arnold's character, thought, and intentions, there are undoubtedly subtle shades of fact and interpretation which await the critical editions mentioned above. Yet it must be said that this book is by all odds the most thoroughgoing and the most penetrating of any of our analyses of Matthew Arnold. Indeed, one regrets that there are so few good books on Arnold by which to indicate the high superiority of this one. It has its faults, to be sure: owing to its rich detail and its generous compass, it needs a few illuminating generalizations to give the study a sharp edge; and one of its virtues becomes at times a liability, in that the frequent footnotes devoted to linking Arnold with contemporary thought sometimes threaten to digress too far and to thin out the discussion of Arnold into one of modern ideas. It is distinctly a book for one who already knows Arnold fairly well; it is not a book on "how to know him"; it is rather the book which critics, scholars, and teachers will welcome as an extremely helpful attempt to place Arnold not only in the pattern of the nineteenth century but also in the whole modern tradition, from the Renaissance to T. S. Eliot and I. A. Richards and Marx and Freud. As such it is not a biography, but, as the author explains, "a biography of Arnold's mind," an account of "Arnold's ideas in their development."

We see that development from the earliest years when Arnold's youthful dandyism hid his struggle against the multitudinous, driving intellect of the time, and his quest—a lifelong search—for integrated force and harmony, or *Tüchtigkeit*. The author ably shows him rejecting, in turn, the claims of action, romantic love, and rationalism, yet seeking in each whatever will contribute to his ideal of "wholeness." At once both a Platonist and a naturalist, Arnold's hatred of system permitted unreconcilables to lie side by side: he used the "scientific materialistic view to combat theology"; he employed the Platonic to combat the arrogant excesses of science. In the end, this accounts for his religious inconsistencies, which we see analyzed in chapter xi, and

which F. H. Bradley so mercilessly exposed. Throughout all this development, Arnold's poetry sings that "self-controlled pity," that "mood of self-commiseration" in the midst of modern dissolution which, Mr. Trilling says, "assures him the lyric gift," and which Arnold constantly tried to overcome by turning to practical activities when the great ancients and the Bible were not quite enough. Education, political and social problems, the immediate cultural issues, and the religious question, all took him out of himself. This manifold activity of Arnold's mind is carefully followed by Mr. Trilling, and its bearing on the older and the present point of view is abundantly indicated.

Mr. Trilling's book contains the first really satisfactory short account of Thomas Arnold—in which we see the father bequeathing to his son the general outlines of the theory of the state; the best criticism so far of Arnold's *Culture and anarchy*; the most satisfactory account of his religious criticism; and a thorough re-examination of Arnold's literary theories, with an intelligent rejection of whatever is clearly weak, yet with a courageous defense of their strength against the condescending critics of today who sweep away his theories in ignorance of his aims and his true relevance to present-day critical problems. No aspect of Arnold's mind has been neglected. In a biography of his mind, one might expect to find some extended discussion of the sources of his ideas—Sophocles, Marcus Aurelius, the Hindu sacred books, Goethe, Spinoza, Wordsworth, Obermann. But no attempt has been made to examine the origin of Arnold's ideas; Mr. Trilling's aim has been to unravel them, to indicate their relative positions, and to judge them wherever a relative judgment would lead to further understanding. If his work is not the last word on Arnold's mind—"I have consulted almost no unpublished material"—and if the study suffers from a lack of sharp contour, of integrating conclusions, it is nevertheless a revealing and original work, full of food for thought, and valuable for its qualities of insight, sane judgment, and wise comprehension of the relevance of Arnold's ideas to the thought of today.

In the Alexander Lectures in English, delivered at the University of Toronto in 1938, Mr. Carleton Stanley, president of Dalhousie University, conducts a spirited, sometimes irascible and opinionated, defense of the organic unity in Arnold's work, against "some pert little critics of our day"—Mr. T. S. Eliot among them—and against the "ignoble, wit-snapping, penny-a-liner" journalists and the "little experts" or scholars, who, without adequate classical foundation, and without either sufficient knowledge or good will, have attacked or ignored Arnold's virtues as poet and critic. Mr. Stanley is distressed that we too often "believe that Arnold in early life devoted himself entirely to 'poetry' pure and simple; [and] that in middle life, having become a school inspector, and being distracted by these duties, his poetic inspiration dried up, and that he took to writing prose, first about literature, later about politics and social questions, of which he knew very little, and later still about religion and theology of which he knew less." This is an excellent statement

of the too widely held conventional notion; but either from considerations of space or from negligence, Mr. Stanley presents very little specific material to refute it. He wants to show the classical substratum in Arnold's poetry and thought, yet gives it only a sketchy and intermittent treatment. He wishes to reveal the organic continuity in Arnold—the critic present in his earliest verses as well as in his *Civilization in the United States*, yet there is so much subjective criticism of Arnold's poems and ideas, so much digression into little bypaths, that the author's main thesis is never clearly demonstrated. It makes good reading, and one cannot help admiring the efforts of a vigorous disciple of Arnold to vindicate his master's claim to greatness; but it will seem to many readers that this quite un-Arnoldian bluster and cocksureness, this pugnacious reply to modern critics whom he clearly does not understand, is not the most persuasive method of bringing harassed and muddy-minded moderns to a sympathetic appreciation of Arnold's sweetness and light. The book consists mainly of a series of analyses of the chief poems and prose pieces, with occasional flashes of excellent insight and epigrammatic phrasing. That it is not in any serious sense a critical study—perhaps it was not intended to be one—is evident from some of Mr. Stanley's dogmatic judgments: of *Mycerinus* he says that "no one has so perfectly retold a Greek story as Arnold has done here"; reading *The forsaken merman*, he "knows nothing in all English poetry so flawlessly beautiful in expression"; if readers ask what Arnold meant by "the grand style," we "can advise them to read his own work, *Sohrab and Rustum*"; he quotes the thirteen stanzas of Arnold's *A wish*, then says, "Now, with that in your ears, think of Tennyson's *Crossing the bar*." This may be an unfair sampling of Mr. Stanley's method, but whatever be our knowledge or our judgment concerning Arnold's achievement, most of us will pull up sharply before such passages, especially since they are inadequately accompanied by criticism. In short, Mr. Stanley's little book of lectures, designed largely, as he tells us on page 38, to show "the influence of Greek poetry and thought on Matthew Arnold," is in reality a vigorous and not very critical vindication of him in a world more and more ignorant of the great classical tradition and less and less persuaded by the methods the author employs.

CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD

Michigan State Normal College

BOOKS RECEIVED

- BANKS, JOHN. *The unhappy favourite, or the Earl of Essex*. Edited with an introduction and notes by THOMAS MARSHALL HOWE BLAIR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xii+143.
- BARKER, RICHARD HINDRY. *Mr. Cibber of Drury Lane*. ("Columbia University studies in English and comparative literature," No. 143.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. 278.
- BARTLETT, HENRIETTA C., and ALFRED W. POLLARD. *A census of Shakespeare's plays in quarto, 1594-1709*. Revised and extended by HENRIETTA C. BARTLETT. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press for the Elizabethan Club; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. v+165.
- BENEDETTO, LUIGI DI. *Rimatori del dolce stil novo*. ("Scrittori d'Italia," No. 172.) Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1939. Pp. 265.
- BROOKS, CLEANTH. *Modern poetry and the tradition*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xi+253.
- CAMPBELL, MARY ELIZABETH. *Defoe's first poem*. Bloomington, Ind.: Principia Press, Inc., 1938. Pp. ix+222.
- CHAPMAN, R. W. *Adjectives from proper names*. ("S.P.E. tracts," No. 52.) Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 51-90.
- ELLIS, LOWELL B., A. J. MATHEWS, and WILLIAM T. STARR. *Three studies in philology*. ("University of Oregon studies in literature and philology," No. 1.) Eugene, Ore.: University of Oregon, [1939]. Pp. 19.
- Essays contributed in honor of President William Allan Neilson*. ("Smith College studies in modern languages," Vol. XXI, Nos. 1-4.) Northampton, Mass., 1939. Pp. vii+269.
- IRVINE, WILLIAM. *Walter Bagehot*. London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., [1939]. Pp. 303.
- JONES, CHARLES W. *Beda's pseudographa: scientific writings falsely attributed to Bede*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xv+154.
- KRAKEUR, LESTER GILBERT. *La Correspondance de Diderot, son intérêt documentaire, psychologique et littéraire*. New York: Kingsley Press, 1939. Pp. 120.
- KURATH, HANS, with the collaboration of MARCUS L. HANSEN, JULIA BLOCH, and BERNARD BLOCH. *Handbook of the linguistic geography of New England*. Providence, R.I.: Brown University, 1939. Pp. xii+240.
- LIPSIUS, JUSTUS. *Two bookes of constancie written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius: Englished by Sir John Stradling*. Edited with an introduction by RUDOLF KIRK. Notes by CLAYTON MORRIS HALL. ("Rutgers University studies in English," No. 2.) New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1939. Pp. ix+223.
- LUQUIENS, FREDERICK BLISS. *Spanish American literature in the Yale University Library: a bibliography*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. x+335.
- MCPEEK, JAMES A. S. *Catullus in strange and distant Britain*. ("Harvard studies in comparative literature," Vol. XV.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii+411.
- MICHA, ALEXANDRE. *Prolégomènes à une édition de Cligès*. Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1938. Pp. 66.
- MICHA, ALEXANDRE. *La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes*. Paris: E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 402.
- MILLER, R. D. *The meaning of Goethe's "Faust"*. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., [1939]. Pp. vi+146.

- NOBBE, GEORGE. *The North Briton: a study in political propaganda*. ("Columbia University studies in English and comparative literature," No. 140.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. ix+274.
- NORDMEYER, GEORGE. *Werden und Wesen der deutschen Sprache*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1939. Pp. viii+120.
- The Old West Frisian "Skellana Riucht."* With an introduction, translation, and notes by SYDNEY FAIRBANKS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xi+176.
- PALFREY, THOMAS ROSSMAN, JOSEPH GUERIN FUCILLA, and WILLIAM COLLAR HOLBROOK. *A bibliographical guide to the Romance languages and literatures*. Evanston, Ill.: Chandler's, Inc., 1939. Pp. ix+82.
- PANOFKY, ERWIN. *Studies in iconology: humanistic themes in the art of the Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxxiii+262.
- PARSELL, JACK ROGERS. *L'Esthétique de Jules Lemaitre*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Burgess Publishing Co., [1939]. Pp. v+89.
- PATCH, HOWARD ROLLIN. *On rereading Chaucer*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xi+269.
- ROSENHAUPT, HANS WILHELM. *Die deutsche Dichter um die Jahrhundertwende und seine Abgelöstheit von der Gesellschaft*. ("Sprache und Dichtung," Heft 66.) Bern-Leipzig: Paul Haupt, 1939. Pp. 287.
- ROY, P. N. *Shelley's "Epipsychidion": a study*. Calcutta: Modern Publishing Syndicate, 1938. Pp. 53.
- SCHICK, JOSEPH S. *The early theater in Eastern Iowa: cultural beginnings and the rise of the theater in Davenport and eastern Iowa, 1836-1863*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1939]. Pp. ix+384.
- SCHWARTZ, WILLIAM LEONARD, and CLARENCE BYRON OLSEN. *The sententiae in the dramas of Corneille*. Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, [1939]. Pp. vii+122.
- TEMPLEMAN, WILLIAM D. *The life and work of William Gilpin (1724-1804), master of the picturesque and Vicar of Boldre*. ("Illinois studies in language and literature," Vol. XXIV, Nos. 3-4.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp. 336.
- THOMPSON, JAMES WESTFALL. *The medieval library*. ("University of Chicago studies in library science.") Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939. Pp. viii+682.
- WEYGANDT, ANN M. *Kipling's reading and its influence on his poetry*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939. Pp. xiii+200.
- YOUNG, LOUISE MERWIN. *Thomas Carlyle and the art of history*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. x+219.

